

DTIC FILE COPY

AD-A199 071

Dual Army Career Officers: Job Attitudes and Career Intentions of Male and Female Officers

Martha L. Teplitzky, Shelley A. Thomas,
and Glenda Y. Nogami

Personnel Utilization Technical Area
Manpower and Personnel Research Laboratory



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

July 1988

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.



88 9 22 005

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

WM. DARRYL HENDERSON
COL, IN
Commanding

Technical review by

Allyn Hertzbach
Gail McGinn, Community and Family Support Center

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PER/POT, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, Virginia 22334-5100.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) ARI Technical Report 805			6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences		
6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) PERI-RP			7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION ---		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) ---		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION ---		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ---	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) ---		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 63731A		PROJECT NO. 2Q263 731A792		TASK NO. 242 H2	
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Dual Army Career Officers: Job Attitudes and Career Intentions of Male and Female Officers					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Martha L. Teplitzky, Shelley A. Thomas, and Glenda Y. Nogami					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final		13b. TIME COVERED FROM 03/85 TO 02/86		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1988, July	
15. PAGE COUNT 67					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION ---					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Careers Military families Retention		
			Dual career Officers Spouses		
			Dual military Career families Work/family conflicts		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) <p>➤ In 1985, dual Army career officers (N = 149) from nine installations in the continental United States were surveyed. Consistent with data from prior research, female officers in dual Army career marriages are much less likely than male officers to have plans early in their careers to stay in the Army until retirement. Concerns about family separations, pregnancy, and childcare appear to be important factors in the career decisions of these couples. Almost half of the dual Army career women said they would leave the Army rather than face a lengthy (1 year or more) separation from their husbands. Furthermore, although only a minority of the sample expressed strong concerns about childcare and pregnancy, the interviews suggested that time constraints and finding high-quality, flexible childcare arrangements were especially problematic given the long hours and erratic work schedules of Army officers</p>					
(Continued)					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Glenda Y. Nogami			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 274-8866		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL PERI-RP

ARI Technical Report 805

19. Abstract (Continued)

Both male and female officers reported that their spouses and supervisors were very supportive of their careers, and both sexes felt that their promotion potential was good. Both male and female officers were also very satisfied with their jobs and the Army in general, although they felt that family concerns should be given a higher priority in the assignment system.

Deployment in the event of war or a national emergency was not seen as a problem, and respondents reported that their families were very committed to the Army mission. In terms of everyday responsibilities, on the other hand, family needs were as likely as Army needs to be given the first priority in the case of a conflict between work and family. Taken as a whole, the results suggest that dual Army career officers enjoy their work and like Army life, but that the demands of the dual Army career lifestyle appear to be perceived by many as being incompatible with family goals.

(SDCW)



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

**Dual Army Career Officers: Job Attitudes
and Career Intentions of Male and Female Officers**

**Martha L. Teplitzky, Shelley A. Thomas,
and Glenda Y. Nogami**

**Personnel Utilization Technical Area
Paul A. Gade, Chief**

**Manpower and Personnel Research Laboratory
Newell K. Eaton, Director**

**U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600**

**Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army**

July 1988

**Army Project Number
2Q263731A792**

Manpower and Personnel

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

FOREWORD

The Personnel Utilization Technical Area of the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences performs research on the factors that lead to retention of Army personnel. Increasingly, the Army's perspective on personnel issues reflects the awareness that soldiers are family members as well as members of the military community. The structure of an individual soldier's immediate family, as well as his or her family-related needs, concerns, and responsibilities, determines the family context within which soldiers perform their duties and make decisions about their careers. This family context and its impact on the job attitudes and career decisions of dual Army career officers are the focus of this report.

The percentage of officers whose spouses are also active-duty officers has increased dramatically since the influx of women into the Army in the early 1970s. Dual Army career officers are confronted with a number of difficult dilemmas, including both the coordination of their careers and the integration of their domestic and childcare responsibilities into their demanding schedules. Concerns for the well-being of dual military career soldiers and their families, as well as concerns about the impact of this demanding lifestyle on military performance, readiness, and retention, have provided the impetus for the research described in this report. The findings discussed focus on the differences between male and female dual Army career officers in their feelings about work and family. The descriptive data provide insight into the stresses and strains of this family structure. The analyses also draw attention to the fact that in some cases conflicts between the Army and family needs are resolved in dual officer couples by having one spouse (typically the wife) leave the Army. In the context of the larger body of on-going research on Army families, this report furthers our understanding of the work/family interface and will contribute to our efforts to better understand, manage, and serve the military population.

The sponsors of this research include the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER), Enlisted Sustainment and Distribution Branch, and the Community and Family Support Center (CFSC). An earlier draft of this paper was forwarded to, and approved by, key personnel in these agencies. Their comments indicated that the information included will be useful in the development of programs and policies for the retention and well-being of officers in dual Army officer career families.



EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

DUAL ARMY CAREER OFFICERS: JOB ATTITUDES AND CAREER INTENTIONS OF MALE AND FEMALE OFFICERS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

Increasingly large numbers of Army officers are marrying fellow officers. The difficulties involved in coordinating two military careers are widely acknowledged, and the Married Army Couples Program has been implemented in an effort to help these couples find career-enhancing joint assignments. Little is known, however, about the impact of dual Army career status on the family life, job attitudes, and career decisions of this group of officers. To continue to design personnel policies and family programs that will have a positive impact on the quality of Army life and the retention of highly trained personnel, we need to increase our understanding of this growing segment of the Army.

Procedure:

In 1985, exploratory interviews were conducted with both spouses in eight dual Army career officer marriages. Surveys designed to tap the most relevant issues were then administered to 149 dual Army career officers across nine installations in the Continental United States. Responses to the attitudinal and career intentions items on the survey are reported separately for male and female officers, and significant differences between the two groups are indicated.

Findings:

Consistent with data from prior research, female officers in dual Army career marriages are much less likely than male officers to have plans early in their careers to stay in the Army until retirement. Concerns about family separations, pregnancy, and childcare appear to be important factors in the career decisions of these couples. Almost half of the dual Army career women said they would leave the Army rather than face a lengthy (1 year or more) separation from their husbands. Furthermore, although only a minority of the officers surveyed had children at the time, over one third of the women in the sample expressed strong concerns about childcare and pregnancy. The interviews suggested that time constraints and finding high-quality, flexible childcare arrangements were especially problematic given the long hours and erratic work schedules of Army officers.

Both male and female officers reported that their spouses and supervisors were very supportive of their careers, and both sexes felt that their promotion potential was good. Both male and female officers were also very satisfied with their jobs and the Army in general, although they felt that family concerns should be given a higher priority in the assignment system.

Deployment in the event of war or a national emergency was not seen as a problem, and respondents reported that their families were very committed to the Army mission. In terms of everyday responsibilities, on the other hand, family needs were as likely as Army needs to be given the first priority in the case of a conflict between work and family. Taken as a whole, the results suggest that dual Army career officers enjoy their work and Army life, but the demands of the dual Army career lifestyle appear to be perceived by many as incompatible with family goals.

Utilization of Findings:

The findings in this study provide information about the concerns, career intentions, and attitudes of dual Army career officers. These findings can be used to inform policy makers about the impact and importance of policies aimed at dual career couples (e.g., the Married Army Couples Program), and they can guide the efforts of family advocates to design programs responsive to the needs of this special segment of the Army population.

**DUAL ARMY CAREER OFFICERS: JOB ATTITUDES AND CAREER INTENTIONS OF MALE
AND FEMALE OFFICERS**

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF THE DUAL MILITARY CAREER COUPLE LITERATURE	2
METHODOLOGY	9
Procedure	9
Sample Selection	9
Scale Construction	10
Analyses	10
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	11
Personal Characteristics	11
Military Characteristics	12
Representativeness of the Sample	13
VARIABLES RELATED TO CAREER DECISIONS	14
Career Intentions	14
Long Separations	16
Career Decision Factors	19
JOB-RELATED ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS	23
Satisfaction with Factors Related to Career Decisions	23
Feelings about Work and the Army	27
Commitment	28
Career Priorities and Assignment Problems	29
Career Support	30
Promotion Opportunities	32
Army Treatment of Dual Army Couples	33
Personal and Family Concerns	34
Officers with Children	34
CONCLUSIONS	37
REFERENCES	41
APPENDIX A. SCALE ITEMS AND RELIABILITIES	A-1
B. DUAL ARMY CAREER OFFICERS QUESTIONNAIRE	B-1

CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Officers: Personal characteristics	11
2. Officers: Military characteristics	12
3. Officers: Grade of respondent by grade of spouse	13
4. Officers: Career intentions	15
5. Officers: Career intentions of respondent and spouse	15
6. Officers: Career intentions by sex and time in service	16
7. Officers: If a future assignment required a long separation (1 year or more) from your spouse, what would you do?	17
8. Officers: Intentions if long separation required, by time in service	18
9. Officers: Career decisions factors rated "very important" by at least 50% of male or female respondents	19
10. Officers: Importance of career decision factors	20
11. Officers: Frequencies for pregnancy and childcare concerns	21
12. Officers (less than 11 years in Army): Importance of decision factors by career intentions	22
13. Officers: How satisfied are you with the following?	24
14. Officers (less than 11 years in Army): Satisfaction with decision factors by career intentions	26
15. Officers: Feelings about work and Army	27
16. Officers: Dual Army couples' (DACS) commitment to Army	28
17. Officers: Career priorities and assignment problems	29
18. Officers: Assignment problems by years married	30
19. Officers: Support for career intentions	31
20. Officers: Beliefs about promotion opportunities	32
21. Officers: Army treatment of dual Army couples (DACS)	33

CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Table 22. Officers: Personal and family concerns	34
23. Officers with children: Work/family role conflict	35
24. Officers with children: Current childcare arrangements . . .	35
25. Officers with children: Satisfaction with childcare arrangements	36
26. Officer with children: Quality of post daycare facilities . .	37

DUAL ARMY CAREER OFFICERS: JOB ATTITUDES AND CAREER INTENTIONS OF MALE AND FEMALE OFFICERS

INTRODUCTION

Since the advent of the All Volunteer Force in 1973, significant numbers of women have been recruited into the Army. About 10% of the active duty force is now female, and 12% of the officer corps is made up of women. One outcome of the influx of women into the Army is that as male and female soldiers have worked and socialized together, many have fallen in love and married. At the same time, social changes of the past decade are encouraging increasing numbers of women to aspire to meaningful careers. The increasing numbers of women in the Army, combined with the reluctance of married women today to give up their work roles are both factors underlying the steady increase over the last 10 to 15 years in the percentage of soldiers in dual Army career marriages.

Currently, almost 37,000 soldiers, comprising over 5% of the active duty force, are in dual Army career marriages (Military Personnel Center, 1988). More than 5,600 of these soldiers are officers, representing over 5% of the total officer corps and 8% of the population of married officers. Because of the smaller pool of women in the Army, the percentage of women in dual Army career marriages is especially high. Approximately 3% of the current population of male officers have spouses who are also in the active Army, in contrast to almost one fourth (23%) of the female officers in the Army.

The large majority of officers in dual Army career marriages are captains. By the end of 1987, almost 5% of all male captains (1444 men) and 33% of all female captains (1464 women) had Army spouses (MILPERCEN, 1988). The preponderance of dual Army career officers at the company grade level suggests that unless these officers have exceptionally high divorce or service separation rates, we can expect the percentage of dual Army career officers to continue to increase.

The emergence of significant numbers of soldier couples poses a critical challenge to the Army. Male and female soldiers with active duty spouses face a number of family and career dilemmas unknown to previous generations of soldiers. The coordination of assignments and career requirements is likely to be difficult and may require couples to choose between enhancing their careers and staying together. In addition, couples who have children experience additional demands on their time and resources, and with both spouses subject to the unexpected demands of military life, childcare can become a major problem. In order to manage and retain dual Army career soldiers, the Army needs to be aware of and responsive to the special concerns of this growing segment of the Army population. The rewards to the Army of effectively managing and supporting soldier couples can be considerable. The majority of these soldiers have several years of Army training and experience behind them. They tend to be older, more experienced, higher ranking and better educated than single soldiers (Raiha, 1986), making them desirable candidates for retention. Furthermore, by virtue of their shared understanding of the mission and requirements of the Army, soldier couples may reinforce each others' dedication and professionalism in a unique and synergistic way. At the same time, however, the dual Army career lifestyle can easily entail personal and family sacrifices that outweigh the rewards of an Army career. Soldier couples who become disillusioned with the system or discouraged in their efforts to

meet the needs of both the Army and their families represent a real loss for the Army, even if one or both spouses decide to stay for economic reasons.

It is incumbent upon the Army to try to understand the concerns and problems of dual Army career couples, and to accommodate, to the extent it is reasonable from a military standpoint, the needs of this important group of soldiers. As long as men and women work together in the Army there will be dual Army career marriages, and both the soldiers themselves, and the Army as a whole stand to benefit if this lifestyle is experienced as viable and satisfying.

The Army has already taken a significant step toward accommodating dual Army career couples in the implementation of the Married Army Couples Program. This program is designed specifically to address the assignment problems of dual Army career soldiers. Within the program, the career needs and assignment options of both spouses are considered simultaneously when either spouse is up for reassignment, maximizing the opportunity for soldier couples to establish a common household (joint domicile). The Military Personnel Center reports that approximately 70% of the officers enrolled in this program are successfully placed within 50 miles of each other. However, information on the concerns, attitudes and career decisions of these officers is needed if we are to better understand and accommodate dual Army career couples.

The research described in the present report is a preliminary effort to address the information needs of the Army in this area. It is part of a larger research program sponsored by the Community and Family Services Center, aimed at better understanding the interface between family considerations and the requirements of a military career. This report draws upon both interviews and surveys to document some of the problems, attitudes and career considerations of dual Army career officers. A subsequent research report will summarize the data from the subsample of enlisted personnel.

The limited empirical literature on dual military career couples stems primarily from family studies conducted in the Air Force and the Navy (e.g., Farkas and Durning, 1972; Orthner, 1980; Orthner and Bowen, 1982). In these studies, dual military career couples are typically examined as a subgroup of a larger sample; the research is not specifically designed to address the issues most relevant to dual military career couples. Studies conducted within the Army focus on performance of dual Army career parents (GAO, 1982) and the personal characteristics and attitudes of dual Army career soldiers relative to soldiers who are single or married to civilians (Raiha, 1986). This body of literature is reviewed below.

REVIEW OF THE DUAL MILITARY CAREER COUPLE LITERATURE

Orthner and his associates have conducted several studies of military families in the Air Force (Carr, Orthner and Brown, 1980; Orthner, 1980; Orthner and Bowen, 1982). In the original "Families in Blue" study (Orthner, 1980), a representative sample of 331 Air Force families living together in the continental United States (CONUS) and Germany were selected for interviews. Of these families, 44 (13%) were dual Air Force couples (both husband and wife in the active Air Force). The sample included both officer and enlisted couples.

Orthner (1980) found that demographically, dual Air Force couples were similar to "traditional" couples (Air Force husband, civilian wife) except in the number of children they had. Almost three fourths of the dual Air Force marriages were childless (80% of the officer/officer marriages and 69% of the enlisted dual military marriages), compared to an overall childless rate of about 30% for traditional Air Force couples (Carr et al., 1980). The authors suggested that the demands of an Air Force career, the tendency of career oriented women in general to delay having children, and the recognition that there are some especially difficult childcare problems associated with having both spouses in the military are at least partly responsible for the fewer number of children found in dual military career marriages.

The Air Force husband/civilian wife couples were also compared to dual Air Force career couples in terms of the quality of their marital relationships and the "traditionality" of the values they held. Approximately 20% of both types of couples reported experiencing some kind of marital strain or problem, however, more of the dual Air Force couples reported being satisfied with the communication and companionship aspects of their marriages. Dual career couples were also more likely than their Air Force husband/civilian wife counterparts to hold nontraditional or liberal family and sex-role values. The sex-role attitudes of 59% of the dual military couples were classified as liberal or "nontraditional", compared to only 29% of the couples where the wife was a civilian. In about one fourth of the dual Air force couples, however, the values of the two spouses were in conflict. Typically, when couples disagreed, the husband's family and sex-roles values were traditional while the wife's orientation was more liberal. Orthner (1980) noted that these "transitional" couples represented a potentially volatile combination. Transitional couples were more likely than couples in which both spouses held similar values (either traditional or nontraditional) to experience poor communication and marital problems.

One of the more general findings of Orthner's (1980) research highlighted the importance of spouse support to the decision to stay in the service. Data based on the total sample of Air Force families indicated that both job morale and intention to stay in the Air Force were strongly related to the degree to which an individual's spouse supported his or her career. Women in the Air Force, however, tend to be at a disadvantage with regard to career support from their spouses. Typically, men in the Air Force get more career support from their spouses (74% report moderate or high support) than Air Force women (57% report moderate to high support). Women whose jobs are especially demanding (e.g. extensive TDY, extra duty, long work weeks) and women with more traditional husbands are the least likely to feel that their spouses support their careers. The lower level of support experienced by women was suggested as one reason fewer women than men intended to make the Air Force a career. Although 66% of the married Air Force men reported that they planned to stay in the Air Force until retirement, only 43% of the married Air Force women voiced similar intentions. Married women without children were more likely than those with children to intend to stay.

In 1981, Orthner and Bowen (1982) conducted a replication of the first "Families in Blue" study with a stratified probability sample of 597 Air Force families living together on bases in the Pacific. Dual military families were over sampled in this study to allow for separate analyses, resulting in a final subsample of 143 dual Air Force couples. Compared to the earlier sample of

families based in the United States and Germany (Orthner, 1980), dual Air Force couples in the Pacific study were more likely to report marital problems. Companionship and sexual intimacy were the main problem areas, and both were attributed, at least in part, to the limited amount of time dual military career couples are able to spend together. Long work weeks, extensive TDY, shifting schedules and separations were the quality of life issues of most concern to the sample as a whole, and these factors are likely to be especially problematic when both spouses are subject to the demands of a military job.

As noted above, Orthner's (1980) study of dual Air Force couples stationed in the continental United States (CONUS) and Germany indicated that there was a disparity between men and women in the level of career support they received from their spouses. This disparity was even more pronounced in the Pacific sample (Orthner and Bowen, 1982). Only 30% of the women in dual Air Force marriages in the Pacific study received strong career support from their spouses, compared to 54% of the men. Furthermore, half of the dual career husbands in the Pacific study stated that they would prefer to see their wives leave the Air Force. It was suggested that the more negative attitudes of husbands in the Pacific study were related to the higher percentage of husbands in this sample, relative to the earlier sample, who held traditional family and sex-role values. In both samples, husbands with more liberal sex-role attitudes and family values were more supportive of their wives' careers.

With regard to career intentions in the Pacific sample, only 49% of the dual military career women, compared to 74% of the men, intended to make the Air Force a career. These percentages are slightly higher than those obtained in the earlier study (Orthner, 1980), but the magnitude of the difference between men and women is comparable. The authors again invoked the lower levels of spouse support received by women, as well as conflicts between military and family responsibilities, as explanations of the lower levels of commitment to an Air Force career exhibited by dual military career women.

Dual Air Force career couples were also the subject of a small pilot study conducted by Williams (1978). William's sample was not representative because only officer couples in which both spouses had already decided to make the Air Force a career were selected for study. However, the interviews with this small group of highly committed officers yielded some interesting insights. First, all of the women in this sample expressed the belief that children limit the career potential of women in dual military career marriages. This was the primary reason none of the women interviewed intended to have children. Nevertheless, several women felt that despite their decision not to have children, their career aspirations were not taken seriously by male colleagues and superiors. They noted that it is still typically assumed that women will eventually give up their careers to have children, and this assumption was perceived as perpetuating a subtle kind of discrimination against women.

Another concern reported by both the men and women in Williams's (1978) study centered on their ability to meet the requirements for promotion while still maintaining a somewhat normal married life. In order to obtain the breadth of experience required for promotion, officers need to relocate frequently and follow a prescribed sequence of assignments. The difficulty for dual military career couples lies in finding career enhancing positions for both spouses at the same location. In some cases, one spouse has to accept a less desirable assignment if the couple wants to stay together. In other

cases, military requirements and incompatible specialties make joint assignments impossible. The couples in Williams' sample indicated that their decisions about assignments and the acceptability of separations were based on a careful consideration of the impact of their various alternatives on both their marriage and their two careers. These couples reported that they were prepared to accept the necessary trade-offs between their careers and their married lives, however, the prospect of having to choose between the two created considerable anxiety as the time for reassignments approached.

The women in William's sample also identified as problematic the military tradition of the wife serving her husband's career by meeting a variety of social obligations. Wives of officers, especially, are expected to participate in social functions and conform to certain norms with regard to their behavior and level of involvement in the life of the post. Several women expressed concern that their inability to fulfill these auxiliary obligations could have a negative impact on their husbands' careers. It is also conceivable that the career of a female officer could be hindered by the lack of a traditional "help-meet" spouse, however, this possibility was not addressed in the interviews.

Despite the difficulties involved, all of the couples interviewed by Williams (1978) were very positive about their dual military career lifestyle. They enjoyed the financial benefits of having two incomes and felt that their lives were more exciting and rewarding because both spouses were pursuing careers. It is worth reiterating, however, that in this highly select sample, both spouses had already resolved any conflicts they might have experienced about combining two military careers with the demands of raising a family. The resolution of emotional conflicts related to the decision to have children, and freedom from the heavy responsibilities associated with raising a family greatly reduce the potential for career/family conflicts.

Dual Navy career couples were the focus of several supplementary analyses in Farkas and Durning's (1982) examination of a stratified random sample of male and female, officer and enlisted personnel in the Navy. Included in their final sample of were 129 respondents with Navy spouses and 222 respondents with working civilian spouses. In a limited number of analyses, respondents with Navy spouses were compared to respondents with civilian working spouses.

The relocation demands of the Navy were problematic for individuals with both Navy and civilian working spouses, however respondents with Navy spouses reported much more difficulty arranging a common work site than those with civilian spouses. Relocation and joint assignment difficulties were also clearly related to career intentions. Thirty-seven percent (37%) of the respondents in dual Navy marriages said that one or both spouses would leave the Navy if in their next assignment, suitable positions for both spouses could not be arranged in the same location. Data on both career intentions and the relative priorities of the careers of the two spouses suggest that when careers are in conflict, it is the wife in a dual Navy couple who is the most likely to leave. A slight majority of the dual Navy women reported that the careers of the two spouses were given equal weight in family decisions. Yet, 30% of the dual Navy women surveyed reported that their spouses' careers would take precedence in the case of a conflict, whereas only 5% said that their own careers would come first. Interestingly, Navy women with civilian husbands were much more likely to attribute greater importance to their own careers; 30%

of the women married to civilians said that their own careers carried more weight than their husbands in family decisions.

Overload from the joint demands of work and family roles and the difficulty coordinating two military careers were identified by Parkas and Lurning as two sources of pressure for one spouse in a dual Navy couple to leave the service. Individuals in dual Navy marriages do, however, have one advantage over Navy personnel with civilian spouses; spouses who are also in the Navy tend to be more accepting of the requirements of the job.

One study which included a focus on dual military couples in the Army was the 1982 General Accounting Office (GAO) survey of the supervisors of sole (single) and "in-service" (dual military career) parents. The research was undertaken in response to concerns by military leaders that single and dual military career parents represented "a serious problem requiring special attention" (GAO, 1982, p. iv). The GAO effort was designed to provide information on the performance and readiness of these parents in order to inform policy makers of the advisability of restricting the enlistments or assignments of these personnel. The survey required supervisors in highly mobile units from Germany and Fort Bragg to evaluate the performance of 262 single and dual Army career parents. Performance evaluations of 178 service members who were not single or dual military career parents were also obtained to serve as a baseline for comparisons.

A number of questions in the GAO (1982) survey concerned instances of lateness or nonavailability for different types of duty. Results indicated that single and dual Army career parents were more likely than the control group to be "occasionally late" or "occasionally unable to participate in shift work". Nevertheless, 90% of the supervisors of single and dual Army career parents indicated that these soldiers were never or only occasionally late, leading the GAO to conclude that the attendance and availability of these parents was satisfactory.

In terms of job performance, supervisory ratings in a variety of areas (quality of work done, amount of work, contribution to morale, and overall performance) indicated that single and dual Army career parents performed as well as the comparison group. In fact, although the differences were not statistically significant, the dual career parents were consistently more likely than individuals in the single parent and comparison groups to receive the very highest ratings. For example, 43% of the dual Army career parents were rated "at the very top" in overall job performance, compared to 31% of the single parents and 33% of the comparison group soldiers.

Supervisory assessments of the readiness of the parent groups to deploy were slightly less positive. More single and dual Army career parents (10% overall) than comparison group soldiers (5%) were rated as somewhat or very likely not to report for duty in the event of deployment. Concerns about the deployability of a small percentage of these parents did not, however, result in significant differences in the percentage of service members in each category who were recommended for retention by their supervisors. Sixty-five percent (65%) of the single parents, 74% of the dual Army career parents, and 73% of the comparison group soldiers were "strongly" recommended for retention by their supervisors.

In their overall conclusions, the authors of the GAO report stated that "the Army lacks a solid basis for restricting enlistment(s) ... or assigning one member of in-service parent couples to positions coded as nondeployable" (1982, p. 11). Their review concluded that "while some problems do exist, most sole and in-service parents included in our survey attend and perform work at least satisfactorily and would most likely deploy in a timely manner in the event of war or a national emergency" (GAO, 1982, p. 11).

A more comprehensive examination of dual Army career couples was undertaken by Raiha (1986) in her re-analysis of the data from the 1983 Soldier Sample Survey. This survey was designed to assess the characteristics and attitudes of a representative sample of active duty soldiers. Raiha compared the responses of dual military career soldiers with single and married non-dual Army career soldiers across a variety of survey items. Of particular interest are the items pertaining to the demographic characteristics and career intentions of dual Army soldiers.

As a group, soldiers in dual Army career marriages are younger, less experienced and lower ranking than married soldiers with civilian spouses, and they are older, more experienced, higher ranking, and better educated than single soldiers. Consistent with the Air Force studies (Carr et al., 1980; Williams, 1978), dual Army career couples are also less likely than other married soldiers to have children. In her representative Army sample, Raiha (1986) found that just under half of the individuals in dual Army career marriages had children, while over three fourths of the soldiers with civilian spouses had children. The youth of dual Army career soldiers relative to other married soldiers is likely to be one factor contributing to the different rates of childlessness. The difficulty combining children with two military careers may be another factor.

Compared to other soldiers, dual Army careerists are also over represented in Europe and the Health Services command. Raiha (1986) notes that the high proportion of dual careerists in the medical and combat service support occupational groups is due to the greater concentration of women in these areas. The high representation of dual Army career couples in Europe may be explained by a preference among these couples for a stabilized minimum three-year tour, most easily accomplished by volunteering for duty in Europe.

On the whole, dual Army career couples were less likely than nondual career married couples to be planning to stay in the Army, even when statistical adjustments were made for the differences between the two groups in demographics and job satisfaction (soldiers in dual Army career marriages were less satisfied with their jobs). The greater possibility of family separations in dual Army career marriages appeared to be a significant factor in their lower level of commitment to an Army career. Being involuntarily separated from one's spouse was associated with lower retention intentions for the sample as a whole, and not surprisingly, individuals in dual Army career marriages were more likely to report being involuntarily separated from their families than soldiers married to civilians. Dual Army career soldiers, and women in particular, were also more likely than soldiers in other marital categories to identify separation from the family as a reason for getting out of the Army.

In summary, the literature on dual military career couples is fairly consistent. First, a much larger proportion of women than men are in dual

military career marriages, and women in these marriages are less likely than men to intend to stay in the service until retirement. The literature suggests a number of factors which may contribute to the disparity between men and women in their propensity to stay in the military. Several studies indicated that career support from one's spouse is strongly related to the intention to stay in the military and women typically receive less support for their careers than their husbands (Farkas and Durning, 1982; Orthner, 1980; Orthner and Bowen, 1982). Women also appear to be especially susceptible to the conflicts associated with dual obligations to family and a career. The career oriented women in William's (1978) study firmly believed that children had a negative impact on the career of a female officer. The time demands of raising children, problems arranging adequate daycare, and attitudes that women with children are not seriously career oriented all appeared to contribute to the perception that children would limit a woman's career potential. The difficulties inherent in coordinating career and family obligations appear to lead some service women to conclude that they can have either children or a successful military career, but not both.

Obtaining career enhancing joint assignments is another problem for dual military career couples. Both male and female soldiers are reluctant to endure long separations from their spouses, preferring in many cases to have one or both spouses leave the service. Since both men and women tend to give the husband's career the higher priority in dual career families, career conflicts are more likely to result in the departure of the wife than the husband. Orthner (1980; Orthner and Bowen, 1982) suggests that traditional sex-role attitudes are one factor associated with a greater emphasis on the husband's career in dual military career families. However, evidence that men in dual Army career marriages tend to be further advanced in their careers than their spouses (Raiha, 1986) suggests that the greater earning power or career potential of the husband may also contribute to the tendency of career conflicts to be resolved in favor of the husband's career.

Although potential problems are the focus of much of the dual career research, a number of positive aspects of the dual career lifestyle are also suggested in this literature. When dual military career couples share values concerning family and sex roles, they are especially positive about the quality of their marital relationship (Orthner, 1980; Orthner and Bowen, 1982). The advantages of two incomes and the excitement and challenge of combining two careers were highlighted by Williams (1978). Farkas and Durning (1982) also indicated that military spouses are likely to be more understanding of the requirements of military life than civilian spouses.

The research reported here builds on the literature reviewed above in that the questionnaire items were specifically designed to address the issues identified as being most important to dual military career couples. The descriptive analyses in this report provide a foundation for understanding the concerns, attitudes and career intentions of dual Army career officers. In addition, possible differences between male and female officers in dual Army career marriages are explored. The discussion of the survey results is supplemented by illustrations and examples from the preliminary interviews.

METHODOLOGY

Procedure

Interviews. This research was conducted in two stages, exploratory preliminary interviews, followed by a large scale survey. The interviews were conducted in 1985 with eight dual Army officer couples (mostly captains) from four CONUS installations. Interviews were conducted individually with each spouse in sessions lasting about two hours each. The interviews focused on areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the Army, opinions about personnel policies relevant to dual Army couples, childcare issues, and the factors affecting career decisions. Interview responses were used to guide the construction of a questionnaire which was subsequently administered to a larger sample of dual Army career couples.

Surveys. Surveys were administered in group sessions to 149 dual Army career officers (67 males, 82 females) from nine CONUS installations. The questionnaires took between 1 and 2 hours to complete, and respondents were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. A copy of the survey is provided in Appendix B.

Sample Selection

Survey participants were selected from lists of dual Army career couples provided by the Military Personnel Center (MILPERCEN). Individuals were included on these lists only if they were enrolled in the Married Army Couples and if both spouses were currently assigned to the same post. This eliminated from the survey population any dual careerists who had not yet enrolled in the program, and all couples who, by design or circumstance were assigned to different posts. MILPERCEN estimates that at any one time, approximately 30% of the officers enrolled in the Married Army Couples Program are not assigned within 50 miles of each other. Those most likely to be living apart are the more senior level personnel, for whom there are typically a more limited number of positions, and soldier couples in unusual or incompatible occupational specialties.

The initial survey sample was randomly selected from the lists provided by MILPERCEN. However, in cases where couples were either no longer at the specified post, or no longer married, replacement couples were selected on-site from more up-to-date lists provided by the individual posts. The original plan called for both spouses in each couple to fill out a questionnaire. In about one third of the cases, however, one member of a couple was unable to appear at the scheduled time because he or she was temporarily off-post (e.g., for travel or field duty) or had prior commitments. The final sample thus includes officers whose spouses were unavailable for the survey (33%) as well as the officers whose spouses also responded (67%).

Because the nonavailability of respondents appeared to be largely related to job demands, individuals in jobs requiring frequent travel, field duty or critical tasks (i.e., they cannot leave for the purpose of taking a survey) are likely to be underrepresented in the sample. In addition, it is important to

keep in mind that dual career couples who were not assigned to the same post were excluded from the sampling frame. An important implication of both of these sample limitations is that problems concerning family separations may be underrepresented in this sample relative to their actual occurrence in the total population of dual Army career families.

Scale Construction

Analyses are based on both single item variables and multi-item scales. The development of the multi-item scales proceeded in three stages. First, internal consistency reliabilities were computed for sets of items which appeared on the basis of content to reflect a single construct (e.g., satisfaction with extrinsic aspects of the job). Next, factor analyses were conducted on larger sets of related items (e.g., all the satisfaction items) in order to assess the appropriateness of the a priori, conceptual groupings of items. Finally, on the basis of both the factor analyses and the reliabilities of the a priori scales, scales were modified by adding or dropping items. The entire sample, including the enlisted personnel as well as the officers was used in constructing scales and computing internal consistency reliabilities. All scales, reliabilities and component items are presented in Appendix A.

The tables presented in the Results section include information on all the usable items in the questionnaire (excluding some of the demographic items on military specialties). Several ambiguous items were deleted for the final analyses (e.g., question 117, satisfaction with family influence), as well as one large set of items (questions 48 to 65) addressing spouse support and various career options. It appeared that in responding to this particular set of items a number of respondents failed to note a reversal in the order of the response alternatives. About 10-20% percent of the respondents gave responses to items in this section that were opposite to their responses to similar items found elsewhere in the questionnaire. Given this discrepancy it was deemed prudent to exclude these items from the analyses.

Analyses

Frequencies for the demographic and career intentions variables are reported first. Beginning with Table 10, means and standard deviations for the attitudinal items are presented. Differences between male and female respondents on these items were assessed using t-tests or analysis of variance. Where differences are significant at the .05 level item means are underlined.

In discussing the results of the quantitative analyses of the survey data, anecdotes and examples from the interview responses are used to illustrate and clarify certain points. It must be noted, however, that although the interview data can provide a "real world" context for interpreting survey results, the interview responses themselves are not generalizable to the population of dual Army career couples. In the discussion of the results, an attempt is made to clearly distinguish between conclusions based on the survey data and interpretations or illustrations derived from the smaller interview sample.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Personal Characteristics

Male and female dual career officers are very similar demographically (see Table 1). Officers of both sexes are predominantly white (84%) and nearly one fourth have advanced degrees beyond college.

TABLE 1
OFFICERS: PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	MALE		FEMALE		OFFICER TOTAL	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
ETHNIC GROUP						
WHITE.....	55	86%	67	82%	122	84%
BLACK.....	6	9%	11	13%	17	12%
OTHER.....	3	5%	4	5%	7	5%
COLLEGE						
BA OR BS.....	49	73%	66	80%	115	77%
PROF/MA/MS/PHD.....	18	27%	16	20%	34	23%
TIMES MARRIED						
ONE.....	52	79%	70	85%	122	82%
TWO.....	13	20%	7	9%	20	14%
THREE OR MORE.....	1	2%	5	6%	6	4%
YEARS MARRIED						
1 YR OR LESS.....	11	16%	10	12%	21	14%
2-3 YRS.....	24	36%	35	43%	59	40%
4-5 YRS.....	16	24%	18	22%	34	23%
6-7 YRS.....	12	18%	9	11%	21	14%
OVER 7 YRS.....	4	6%	10	12%	14	9%
SPOUSE IN ARMY WHEN YOU MARRIED						
NO.....	11	16%	12	15%	23	15%
YES.....	56	84%	70	85%	126	85%
CURRENT HOUSING						
ON POST-FAM HOUSING.....	2	3%	2	2%	4	3%
OFF POST-GOV FUNDED.....	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%
OFF POST-CIV.....	65	97%	79	96%	144	97%
NUMBER OF CHILDREN LIVING WITH YOU						
NONE.....	44	66%	55	71%	99	68%
ONE.....	15	22%	14	18%	29	20%
TWO.....	6	9%	6	8%	12	8%
3 OR MORE.....	2	3%	3	4%	5	3%

Most officers reported that their spouses were already in the Army when they married (85%), and for all but 20% it was their first marriage. Respondents had been married an average of four years, with the majority married three or fewer years (54%) and only 9% married for more than seven years. Most officer couples surveyed were still childless (68%), and the couples who did have children typically had only one.

Military Characteristics

Of the officers surveyed, 83% were in the Regular Army, and 16% were in the Army Reserves (see Table 2). The majority of both men and women were commissioned through ROTC (66% and 54%, respectively), however a sizeable proportion of women (27%) reported that the source of their commission was something other than ROTC, USMA or OCS. Those in the "other" category are likely to have received direct commissions.

TABLE 2
OFFICERS: MILITARY CHARACTERISTICS

	MALE		FEMALE		OFFICER TOTAL	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
BRANCH OF SERVICE						
REGULAR ARMY.....	57	85%	65	81%	122	83%
ARMY RESERVES.....	10	15%	14	17%	24	16%
OTHER.....	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%
HOW LONG COMMISSIONED						
1-3 YRS.....	9	14%	22	27%	31	21%
4-6 YRS.....	19	29%	36	45%	55	38%
7-9 YRS.....	16	25%	9	11%	25	17%
OVER 9 YRS.....	21	32%	13	16%	34	23%
SOURCE OF COMMISSION						
OCS.....	6	9%	8	10%	14	10%
USMA.....	10	15%	7	9%	17	12%
ROTC.....	43	66%	43	54%	86	59%
OTHER.....	6	9%	22	27%	28	19%
YEARS IN SERVICE						
1-3 YRS.....	10	15%	23	28%	33	22%
4-6 YRS.....	18	27%	31	38%	49	33%
7-9 YRS.....	14	21%	13	16%	27	18%
10 + YRS.....	24	36%	15	18%	39	26%
GRADE						
O1-O2.....	12	18%	22	27%	34	23%
O3.....	44	66%	52	63%	96	64%
O4 +.....	11	16%	8	10%	19	13%
GRADE OF SPOUSE						
W1-W2.....	1	1%	4	5%	5	3%
W3-W4.....	0	0%	3	4%	3	2%
O1-O2.....	17	25%	15	18%	32	21%
O3.....	41	61%	49	60%	90	60%
O4 +.....	8	12%	11	13%	19	13%

Female officers had typically served less time in the Army than their male counterparts. Women averaged just over six years in service compared to almost eight and a half years for men. Correspondingly, more women (41%) than men (23%) had received their commissions within the last four years, and more women than men were still first or second lieutenants (27% versus 18%). However, the majority of both male and female officers in this sample were captains ("O3" in the table).

Husbands and wives generally held the same rank (see Table 3), but when there were differences, the husband nearly always outranked his wife. For example, of the 22 female lieutenants, eight were married to captains and one was married to a major. Of the 12 male lieutenants, however, only one was married to a woman who was senior to him in rank.

TABLE 3
OFFICERS: GRADE OF RESPONDENT BY GRADE OF SPOUSE

	GRADE OF SPOUSE							
	M1-M4		O1-O2		O3		O4 +	
	(N)	(x)	(N)	(x)	(N)	(x)	(N)	(x)
MALE								
O1-O2.....	0	0x	11	92x	1	8x	0	0x
O3.....	0	0x	6	14x	35	80x	3	7x
O4 +.....	1	9x	0	0x	5	45x	5	45x
TOTAL.....	1	1x	17	25x	41	61x	8	12x
FEMALE								
O1-O2.....	1	5x	12	55x	8	36x	1	5x
O3.....	6	12x	3	6x	40	77x	3	6x
O4 +.....	0	0x	0	0x	1	13x	7	88x
TOTAL.....	7	9x	15	18x	49	60x	11	13x

Representativeness of the Sample

The present sample of dual Army career officers appears to be quite similar to the representative sample examined by Raiha (1986). In both samples, about 84% of the couples were white, and about two thirds were childless. In terms of military experience, the majority of officers in both samples were captains, and men generally had more time in service than women in dual Army career marriages. However, the difference between the length of time men and women had been in the Army was not as great in the present sample as in the soldier survey sample (Raiha, 1986). In the representative sample, male officers in dual Army career marriages had almost four years more experience than their female counterparts, whereas the difference in the present sample was only about two and a half years. In addition, both male and female officers in the present research averaged less time in service than the officers in the soldier survey sample. Officers in the sample examined here averaged just over six years in service, compared to almost eight years of Army experience for the officers in Raiha's (1986) sample.

The disparity in experience levels of officers in the two samples may be due to the exclusion in the present study of couples who were not currently assigned to the same post. More senior level officers typically have fewer career enhancing assignment options, and thus are more likely than less experienced officers to have difficulty obtaining joint assignments. The

present sample appears to be reasonably representative of dual Army career officers currently assigned to the same post, however, it must be remembered that more experienced officers are underrepresented, and those living apart from their spouses are not included at all.

VARIABLES RELATED TO CAREER DECISIONS

Career Intentions

The dual Army officers' current career intentions, as well as the career intentions these officers attributed to their spouses are shown in Tables 4 and 5. In Table 4, the distribution of responses to the seven career alternatives listed in the questionnaire are shown. In Table 5 and in subsequent tables where responses are broken down by career intentions, the seven response alternatives have been collapsed into the following three categories:

1. Stay Until Retirement, including only:
 - a) "Stay in the Army Until Retirement."
2. Undecided, including:
 - b) "Stay after completion of obligation, but undecided about staying until retirement."
 - c) "I am undecided about action after present obligation."
3. Probably/Definitely Leave, including:
 - d) "Probably leave upon completion of present obligation."
 - e) "Definitely leave upon completion of present obligation."
 - f) "Probably leave before the end of present obligation."
 - g) "Definitely leave before the end of present obligation."

As indicated in Table 4, nearly all of the male officers and almost three fourths of the female officers anticipate staying in the Army at least beyond their current obligations (91% and 71%, respectively). Men, however, are much more likely than women to intend to make the Army a career. Seventy-eight percent (78%) of the male Officers and only 45% of female officers report that they intend to stay in the Army until retirement. This trend is also reflected in the data on spouse career intentions (see Table 5). Over twice as many women as men report that their spouses intend to stay in the Army until retirement.

TABLE 4
OFFICERS: CAREER INTENTIONS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	(N)	(X)	(N)	(X)	(N)	(X)
CAREER INTENTIONS						
STAY IN UNTIL RET.....	32	78x	37	45x	89	60x
STAY AFT CURR OBL.....	9	13x	21	26x	30	20x
UNDEC AFT CURR OBL.....	3	4x	11	13x	14	9x
PRB LV AFT CURR OBL.....	0	0x	8	10x	8	5x
DEF LV AFT CURR OBL.....	3	4x	4	5x	7	5x
DEF LV DUR CURR OBL.....	0	0x	1	1x	1	1x
COLUMN TOTAL.....	67	100x	82	100x	149	100x

TABLE 5
OFFICERS: CAREER INTENTIONS
OF RESPONDENT AND SPOUSE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	(N)	(X)	(N)	(X)	(N)	(X)
RESPONDENT'S CAREER INTENTIONS						
STAY TILL RETIRE.....	52	78x	37	45x	89	60x
UNDECIDED.....	12	18x	32	39x	44	30x
PROB/DEF LEAVE.....	3	4x	13	16x	16	11x
TOTAL.....	67	100x	82	100x	149	100x
SPOUSE'S CAREER INTENTIONS						
STAY TILL RETIRE.....	23	34x	62	76x	85	57x
UNDECIDED.....	31	46x	17	21x	48	32x
PROB/DEF LEAVE.....	13	19x	3	4x	16	11x
TOTAL.....	67	100x	82	100x	149	100x

The presence of time in service differences between men and women suggests that differences in career intentions might be an artifact of the generally more advanced career stage of the men in the sample. The more years an individual has been in the Army, the less likely he or she is to consider leaving before retirement. To control for a possible time in service effect, career intentions were examined separately for four different tenure groups (see Table 6).

Specific percentages are unreliable because of the small number of respondents in each category, however the patterns in the data suggest an

interesting trend. The percentages of men and women who intend to stay in the Army are similar for officers who have seven or more years of service. The majority of both men and women intend to stay. There are dramatic differences, however, in the percentages of men and women who report firm intentions to stay while they are still in the early stage of their careers. In the 1-3 and 4-6 year categories, only about one quarter of the women, compared to almost three quarters of the men, report that they intend to stay in the Army until retirement. Female officers in dual Army career marriages appear to have adopted a "wait and see" attitude toward their careers in the Army, while the majority of their male counterparts appear to have planned on an Army career from the beginning.

TABLE 6
OFFICERS: CAREER INTENTIONS BY SEX
AND TIME IN SERVICE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
1-3 YRS IN SERVICE						
STAY TILL RETIRE..	7	70%	6	26%	13	39%
UNDECIDED.....	2	20%	13	57%	15	45%
PROB/DEF LEAVE....	1	10%	4	17%	5	15%
COLUMN TOTAL.....	10	100%	23	100%	33	100%
4-6 YRS IN SERVICE						
STAY TILL RETIRE..	13	72%	8	26%	21	47%
UNDECIDED.....	4	22%	14	45%	18	37%
PROB/DEF LEAVE....	1	6%	9	29%	10	20%
COLUMN TOTAL.....	18	100%	31	100%	49	100%
7-9 YRS IN SERVICE						
STAY TILL RETIRE..	9	64%	9	69%	18	67%
UNDECIDED.....	4	29%	4	31%	8	30%
PROB/DEF LEAVE....	1	7%	0	0%	1	4%
COLUMN TOTAL.....	14	100%	13	100%	27	100%
10 + YRS IN SERVICE						
STAY TILL RETIRE..	23	96%	14	93%	37	95%
UNDECIDED.....	1	4%	1	7%	2	5%
COLUMN TOTAL.....	24	100%	15	100%	39	100%

Long Separations

The possibility of a long-term separation from one's spouse is an ever present threat for dual Army career couples. Unwillingness to accept such a separation appears to be one reason a number of dual career officers

(especially women) elect to leave the service. When asked what they would do if a future assignment required a separation of one year or more, only about one quarter of the women and one third of the men said that they would accept the separation (see Table 7).

TABLE 7
OFFICERS:
IF A FUTURE ASSIGNMENT REQUIRED A LONG SEPARATION (1 YEAR OR MORE)
FROM YOUR SPOUSE, WHAT WOULD YOU DO?

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	(N)	(X)	(N)	(X)	(N)	(X)
ACCEPT SEPARATION.....	22	34%	19	24%	41	28%
LEAVE THE ARMY.....	11	17%	35	44%	46	32%
SPOUSE LEAVE ARMY.....	19	29%	3	4%	22	15%
OTHER.....	13	20%	23	29%	36	25%
COLUMN TOTAL.....	65	100%	80	100%	145	100%

The most common solution to the dilemma posed by the prospect of a separation was for the wife to leave the Army. Twenty-nine percent (29%) of the male officers said that their spouses would leave the Army, and 44% of the women themselves said that they would leave if a future assignment required a long separation. In contrast, only 4% of the women and 17% of the men indicated that the husband in the family would be the one to leave. Women with six or fewer years in service were the most likely to say that they would give up their Army careers, however, women exhibit a greater willingness to leave than their male counterparts across all four of the tenure groups (see Table 8).

Unfortunately, the option that both spouses would leave the Army was not included as a response alternative. Some of the 25% of the respondents who selected "other" as a response may have had this option in mind. Another possibility for those who selected the "other" response is that one spouse would leave the active Army but would enlist in the National Guard or Army Reserve. These possibilities suggest that the percentages associated with "I would leave the Army" and "My spouse would leave the Army" may underrepresent the actual number of dual career officers who would rather leave active duty than accept a long separation.

The greater willingness of women, relative to men, to give up their Army careers is consistent with the traditional emphasis on the primacy of the family role for women, and the importance of the work, or breadwinner role for men. Interview comments, however, suggest that practical rather than ideological considerations frequently underlie the career decisions of dual Army career couples. The fact that husbands typically have more time invested in their careers than their wives appears to be an especially salient factor.

TABLE 8
OFFICERS: INTENTIONS IF LONG SEPARATION REQUIRED,
BY TIME IN SERVICE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	(N)	(x)	(N)	(x)	(N)	(x)
1-3 YRS IN SERVICE						
ACCEPT SEPARATION.	3	30x	5	23x	8	25x
LEAVE THE ARMY....	3	30x	10	45x	13	41x
SPOUSE LEAVE ARMY.	3	30x	0	0x	3	9x
OTHER.....	1	10x	7	32x	8	25x
COLUMN TOTAL.....	10	100x	22	100x	32	100x
4-6 YRS IN SERVICE						
ACCEPT SEPARATION.	3	17x	5	17x	8	17x
LEAVE THE ARMY....	6	33x	16	53x	22	46x
SPOUSE LEAVE ARMY.	5	28x	0	0x	5	10x
OTHER.....	4	22x	9	30x	13	27x
COLUMN TOTAL.....	18	100x	30	100x	48	100x
7-9 YRS IN SERVICE						
ACCEPT SEPARATION.	4	31x	4	31x	8	31x
LEAVE THE ARMY....	1	8x	4	31x	5	19x
SPOUSE LEAVE ARMY.	5	38x	1	8x	6	23x
OTHER.....	3	23x	4	31x	7	27x
COLUMN TOTAL.....	13	100x	13	100x	26	100x
10 + YRS IN SERVICE						
ACCEPT SEPARATION.	12	52x	5	33x	17	45x
LEAVE THE ARMY....	1	4x	5	33x	6	16x
SPOUSE LEAVE ARMY.	6	26x	2	13x	8	21x
OTHER.....	4	17x	3	20x	7	18x
COLUMN TOTAL.....	23	100x	15	100x	38	100x

For example, in two cases where both spouses were strongly committed to an Army career, the wives said that they, rather than their husbands would be the ones to leave the Army if faced with a long separation, primarily because their husbands had seniority. In one case, the husband had only two more years in service than his wife, but he was deemed to have greater career potential in the Army. Both spouses also felt that the wife would be more likely than the husband to find a comparable civilian job. In the other case, the wife had 8 years in the Army and felt that she had excellent promotion potential, however her husband's career was peaking after 20 years and there was no question that he would stay. Given the strong preferences for an Army career expressed by both these women, it might seem surprising that they would be willing to leave the Army rather than face long, but temporary separation. However, several women made it clear that a separation represented much more than an inconvenience or a period of loneliness to be endured for the sake of their careers. Both women believed that long-term separations generally caused serious marital problems and increased the likelihood of divorce. For these

women, along separation represented a choice between marriage and career, and they were not willing to jeopardize their marriages to remain in the Army.

Career Decision Factors

The value dual career couples place on staying together was especially apparent in the importance attributed to "joint domicile" in the career decision process. In an item asking respondents to rate the importance of 23 factors to their career decisions, the ability to maintain a joint domicile was given a "very important" rating more often than any other factor (see Table 9). Concerns about family life, marriage, jobs, and promotion opportunities were also very important factors for both men and women, although women tended to give slightly more weight than the men to marriage and concerns.

TABLE 9

Officers: Career Decision Factors Rated "Very Important"
by at least 50% of Male or Female Respondents

MALE	FEMALE
* Joint Domicile (78%)	* Joint Domicile (88%)
Job (73%)	* Marriage Concerns (71%)
Promotion Opportunities (65%)	* Family Life (67%)
* Family Life (63%)	Job (67%)
Feelings about Army (61%)	* Army view of Dual Army Couples (63%)
Benefits (53%)	Promotion Opportunities (56%)
* Marriage Concerns (52%)	Feelings about Army (56%)
	* Assignments (52%)
	Pay (51%)
	Benefits (50%)

* = Items included in Dual Career/Marriage Concerns Scale in Table 10

Table 10 presents the means for male and female officers on the four scales computed from the original set of 23 items and the six remaining single item variables. Three variables, Army job, promotion potential, and dual Army career assignment and marriage concerns were rated as the most important career decision factors by both men and women. The means presented in Table 10 also indicate that pregnancy and childcare concerns are least likely to be rated as important factors in the career decisions of male and female dual Army career officers.

TABLE 10
OFFICERS: IMPORTANCE OF CAREER DECISION FACTORS
(HIGH SCORE INDICATES HIGH IMPORTANCE)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
PAY, BENEFITS & SECURITY			
MEAN.....	3.12	3.13	3.13
STD DEV.....	.49	.65	.58
ARMY LIFESTYLE, LEADERS & PEOPLE			
MEAN.....	3.18	3.19	3.18
STD DEV.....	.57	.53	.55
DUAL CAREER, ASSIGNMENT, MARRIAGE CONCERNS			
MEAN.....	3.46	3.56	3.51
STD DEV.....	.49	.48	.49
CONCERNS ABOUT PREGNANCY			
MEAN.....	<u>2.15</u>	<u>2.53</u>	2.36
STD DEV.....	<u>1.18</u>	<u>1.05</u>	1.11
ARMY JOB			
MEAN.....	3.72	3.65	3.68
STD DEV.....	.49	.50	.50
PROMOTION POTENTIAL			
MEAN.....	3.61	3.41	3.50
STD DEV.....	.60	.78	.71
CHILDCARE CONCERNS			
MEAN.....	2.25	2.54	2.41
STD DEV.....	1.24	1.34	1.29
TRAVEL			
MEAN.....	2.78	2.60	2.68
STD DEV.....	.93	.84	.88
LIVING QUARTERS			
MEAN.....	2.46	2.63	2.56
STD DEV.....	1.11	1.01	1.06
ASSIGNED POST			
MEAN.....	2.61	2.62	2.62
STD DEV.....	.89	.83	.85

NOTE 1: THE FIRST 4 FACTORS ARE MULTIPLE ITEM SCALES.
NOTE 2: SIGNIFICANT MALE/FEMALE DIFFERENCES ($P < .05$) ARE UNDERLINED.

The pregnancy and childcare means should be interpreted with caution, however. First, the large standard deviations for these items (especially "childcare concerns") suggests that the mean is a poor indicator of the central tendency of the distribution of responses. There is, in fact, no central tendency, because as the frequencies in Table 11 illustrate, responses to these items are bimodally, rather than normally distributed. The means suggest that pregnancy and childcare concerns are a minor consideration in the career decisions of the "average" female dual Army career officer. The frequencies,

on the other hand, indicate that childcare concerns are "very important" factors for 38% of the female officers and either "not applicable" or "not at all important" to an equal percentage of women. The majority of women also rated pregnancy concerns as either very important or not important at all. In both cases, the more neutral responses suggested by the mean are not representative of the feelings of dual Army career women.

TABLE 11
OFFICERS: FREQUENCIES FOR PREGNANCY AND CHILDCARE CONCERNS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	(N)	(x)	(N)	(x)	(N)	(x)
PREGNANCY						
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	34	52x	28	34x	62	42x
FAIRLY UNIMPORTANT..	7	11x	10	12x	17	11x
FAIRLY IMPORTANT....	12	18x	22	27x	34	23x
VERY IMPORTANT.....	13	20x	22	27x	35	24x
ARMY VIEW OF PREGNANCY						
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	24	37x	18	22x	42	29x
FAIRLY UNIMPORTANT..	19	29x	17	21x	36	24x
FAIRLY IMPORTANT....	11	17x	27	33x	38	26x
VERY IMPORTANT.....	11	17x	20	24x	31	21x
CHILDCARE CONCERNS						
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	29	43x	31	38x	60	40x
FAIRLY UNIMPORTANT..	7	10x	7	9x	14	9x
FAIRLY IMPORTANT....	16	24x	13	16x	29	19x
VERY IMPORTANT.....	15	22x	31	38x	46	31x

Another factor should also be considered in assessing the importance of pregnancy and childcare concerns relative to other career decision criteria. All of the other career decision factors listed in the questionnaire (e.g., pay and benefits, assignment concerns, travel, Army job) are at least potentially relevant to all dual Army career soldiers. The childcare and pregnancy items, however, are relevant only to those who have young children or are planning on starting a family. Individuals for whom these issues are irrelevant (e.g., those who have decided to remain childless, or those with older children) are likely to give these factors the lowest importance ratings, reducing the means considerably. In future research it would be useful to include questions additional questions on family status and future plans for children. The relative importance of various career decision factors could then be rank ordered separately for those for whom child related concerns are potentially relevant.

The preliminary interviews suggested that time constraints are related to pregnancy and childcare concerns among women who have, or are planning to have children. Nearly every officer interviewed agreed that it was very difficult to combine raising children with the requirements of a military career. Military jobs often entail long hours, travel, unexpected schedule changes and occasional alerts and field exercises. These demands leave little time for family. One woman, for example, said that her "absurdly long" working hours

left her with so little time for her husband and children that she considered her family life "ruined". This woman expected to stay in the Army until retirement, but noted that children had curtailed her career ambitions considerably.

TABLE 12
OFFICERS (LESS THAN 11 YRS IN ARMY):
IMPORTANCE OF DECISION FACTORS BY CAREER INTENTIONS
(HIGH SCORE INDICATES HIGH IMPORTANCE)

	STAY TILL RETIRE		UNDECIDED/LEAVE	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
PAY, BENEFITS & SECURITY				
MEAN.....	3.18	3.37	3.03	2.87
RESPONDENTS.....	34	25	14	44
ARMY LIFESTYLE, LEADERS & PEOPLE				
MEAN.....	3.27	3.26	3.27	3.13
RESPONDENTS.....	34	26	14	44
DUAL CAREER, ASSIGNMENT, MARRIAGE CONCERNS				
MEAN.....	3.55	3.58	3.76	3.49
RESPONDENTS.....	34	26	14	44
CONCERNS ABOUT PREGNANCY				
MEAN.....	2.21	2.25	2.18	2.72
RESPONDENTS.....	33	26	14	44
ARMY JOB				
MEAN.....	3.85	3.68	3.64	3.68
RESPONDENTS.....	34	25	14	44
PROMOTION POTENTIAL				
MEAN.....	3.73	3.85	3.64	3.16
RESPONDENTS.....	33	26	14	44
CHILDCARE CONCERNS				
MEAN.....	2.38	2.35	2.79	2.66
RESPONDENTS.....	34	26	14	44
TRAVEL				
MEAN.....	2.85	2.52	2.57	2.47
RESPONDENTS.....	34	25	14	43
LIVING QUARTERS				
MEAN.....	2.59	2.73	2.86	2.52
RESPONDENTS.....	34	26	14	44
ASSIGNED POST				
MEAN.....	2.68	2.65	3.07	2.57
RESPONDENTS.....	34	26	14	44

a SIGNIFICANT (P < .05) CAREER INTENTIONS MAIN EFFECT.

b SIGNIFICANT (P < .05) SEX MAIN EFFECT.

c SIGNIFICANT (P < .05) CAREER INTENTIONS BY SEX INTERACTION.

Women who are anticipating starting families seem to be aware of the trade-offs involved in balancing careers and families. The stress and conflicts generated by the attempt to excel in both roles at once leads some women to choose one role over the other. For example, two women who were undecided about staying in the Army at the time of the interviews said they would definitely leave if and when they had children. Both cited as reasons their desire to spend more time with their children than a career in the Army would allow. One woman added that she would love to resume her Army career four or five years after starting her family if that option were available to military parents.

Looking at the career decision factors from a retention perspective, it is instructive to examine separately the ratings given by those with most of their careers still ahead of them (i.e., those who still have a fairly high probability of leaving the Army). Table 12 reports the means for officers with 10 or fewer years in service, broken down by both sex and career intentions. Most striking is the similarity of the ratings across groups. There were only two significant differences related to sex and career intentions: the pay, benefits and security factor was more important for those intending to stay in the Army, and promotion potential was less important for women in the undecided/leaving category. The career decision factors identified as most important: Army job, promotion potential and dual career assignment and marriage concerns, were the same for all four subgroups.

In summary, the data on career decision factors suggest that most male and female dual Army officers agree that jobs, promotion potential, and dual career/marriage concerns (especially joint domicile) are very important in their career decisions. The same variables are important regardless of career stage or career intentions. The child care and pregnancy items received the lowest overall mean importance ratings, but the distribution of responses indicated that child care concerns are actually a very important factor for over a third of the women surveyed. These data suggest that generalizations about pregnancy and childcare concerns should be made cautiously; means may obscure important, real differences across subgroups of women in the importance they ascribe to these issues.

JOB-RELATED ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS

Satisfaction With Factors Related To Career Decisions

Overall, dual career officers display a fairly high level of satisfaction, and the responses of men and women are strikingly similar (see Table 13). For both male and female officers, jobs, travel, and living quarters receive the highest satisfaction ratings, and the child care and pregnancy concern items receive the lowest ratings. For most items, however, "satisfied" was the modal response. In fact, for all but three of the 22 satisfaction items, the "satisfied" response alternative was selected by at least 50% of the sample. The exception on the positive side was Army job, where among men, a large percentage were "very satisfied" (39%) in addition to the many who were "satisfied" (48%). The other two exceptions were the items ranking lowest in average satisfaction, "child care concerns" and "the Army's view of pregnant women". Over half of the female respondents reported being either dissatisfied

(43%) or very dissatisfied (61%) with the way the Army views pregnant women, and almost half were either dissatisfied (14%) or very dissatisfied (34%) with the child care situation.

TABLE 13
OFFICERS: HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE FOLLOWING?
(HIGH SCORE INDICATES HIGH SATISFACTION)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
PAY, BENEFITS & SECURITY			
MEAN.....	2.91	2.92	2.92
STD DEV.....	.43	.47	.45
ARMY LIFESTYLE, LEADERS & PEOPLE			
MEAN.....	3.00	2.92	2.96
STD DEV.....	.50	.44	.47
DUAL CAREER, ASSIGNMENT, MARRIAGE CONCERNS			
MEAN.....	2.99	3.04	3.02
STD DEV.....	.43	.43	.43
ARMY VIEW OF PREGNANCY			
MEAN.....	2.52	2.27	2.38
STD DEV.....	.74	.74	.75
JOB			
MEAN.....	3.22	3.06	3.14
STD DEV.....	.76	.72	.74
PROMOTION POTENTIAL			
MEAN.....	3.00	2.85	2.92
STD DEV.....	.67	.55	.61
CHILD CARE CONCERNS			
MEAN.....	2.64	2.26	2.44
STD DEV.....	.60	1.04	.87
TRAVEL			
MEAN.....	3.20	3.15	3.17
STD DEV.....	.53	.36	.45
LIVING QUARTERS			
MEAN.....	3.09	3.09	3.09
STD DEV.....	.67	.74	.71
THE POST WHERE I AM ASSIGNED			
MEAN.....	2.99	2.92	2.95
STD DEV.....	.83	.67	.74

NOTE 1: THE FIRST 3 FACTORS ARE MULTIPLE ITEM SCALES.

NOTE 2: SIGNIFICANT MALE/FEMALE DIFFERENCES ARE UNDERLINED.

Interview comments provide some insight into the reasons underlying the dissatisfaction in these areas. With regard to the Army view of pregnant women, there appear to be two potentially important sources of discontent. First, everyone interviewed agreed that pregnant women in the Army tend not to be viewed favorably. Pregnant women are often perceived as taking advantage of their condition to get out of work, and colleagues resent it when they have to

cover for a pregnant woman who is not "pulling her own weight" in the unit. Legitimate medical reasons, regulations, or over protective supervisors do sometimes limit the activities of pregnant women. However, most women interviewed believed that the negative attitudes toward pregnant soldiers were largely a result of feelings that women, and especially pregnant women, do not belong in the Army. Women reported that pregnant officers, for example, may be characterized as not being serious about their careers because they have chosen to have children. In other cases, female officers have been viewed as letting their troops down because men believe that women cannot serve as effective role models when they are pregnant.

Negative attitudes are not the only difficulties pregnant women encounter. Army policies on maternity leave are also problematic for many. Maternity leave, like the leave granted for a physical disability or injury, is supposed to be limited to the minimum amount of time required for medical recovery. Standard practice is to allow four weeks recovery time for a normal birth. Many women, however, are not prepared physically or emotionally to resume their full slate of activities four weeks after giving birth. As one woman pointed out, regular uniforms are not likely to fit only four weeks after giving birth, and only the most extraordinary women will be ready to resume PT and pass the tests. Furthermore, even if a mother is physically and emotionally ready to leave her four week old infant for 8 to 10 hours a day, very few childcare providers (including most post day care centers) accept infants only four weeks old.

With regard to childcare, women reported in the interviews that their childcare difficulties included not only finding good, regular and affordable day care for working hours (or feeling guilty about accepting barely adequate child care), but also making arrangements for sick children, field exercises, alerts, TDY, "obligatory" social functions and overtime. The lack of adequate facilities for the care of pre-schoolers as well as problems arranging after school supervision for older children both appear to contribute to dissatisfaction women feel with regard to childcare issues.

The satisfaction data reported in Table 13 are based on the entire sample of officers. Of particular interest, however, are the differences between those who intend to stay and those who are planning on leaving. Table 14 provides means on the satisfaction items broken out by career decision factors (Table 12), male and female satisfaction responses are very similar. As one might expect, however, the means for the two career intentions groups are significantly different in several areas. Those who intend to stay until retirement are most satisfied with their jobs, travel, and their currently assigned posts. Those in the "undecided/leave" category exhibit a significantly lower level of satisfaction in these three areas as well as three others: promotion potential, Army lifestyle and dual career concerns.

In addition to the generally lower levels of satisfaction reported by the "undecided/leaving officers", there are two interesting differences in the rank ordering of the satisfaction factors across the two career groups. First, officers who are considering leaving the Army are most satisfied with their living quarters (typically off post civilian housing) and only moderately satisfied with their jobs relative to other factors. Among the officers who intend to stay in the Army, on the other hand, Army job ranks first in terms of satisfaction, while living quarters (one of the least important career decision

factors) is ranked sixth. In addition, those in the "undecided/leave" category are relatively dissatisfied with their current post (only child care and pregnancy rank lower), whereas assigned post has one of the highest mean satisfaction ratings for those intending to stay.

TABLE 14
OFFICERS (LESS THAN 11 YRS IN ARMY):
SATISFACTION WITH DECISION FACTORS BY CAREER INTENTIONS
(HIGH SCORE INDICATES HIGH SATISFACTION)

	STAY TILL RETIRE		UNDECIDED/LEAVE		
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	
PAY, BENEFITS & SECURITY MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	2.91 33	3.05 26	2.80 11	2.88 36	
ARMY LIFESTYLE, LEADERS & PEOPLE MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	3.13 34	3.10 26	2.70 14	2.86 40	a
DUAL CAREER, ASSIGNMENT, MARRIAGE CONCERNS MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	3.01 33	3.21 26	2.91 14	2.95 42	a
ARMY VIEW OF PREGNANCY MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	2.55 31	2.52 25	2.50 12	2.20 40	
ARMY JOB MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	3.38 34	3.24 25	2.71 14	2.95 43	a
PROMOTION POTENTIAL MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	3.12 34	3.08 26	2.71 14	2.84 43	a
CHILD CARE CONCERNS MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	2.59 17	2.64 11	2.60 10	2.11 18	
TRAVEL MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	3.21 34	3.31 26	3.00 13	3.07 40	a
LIVING QUARTERS MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	3.00 29	3.14 22	3.09 11	3.11 36	
ASSIGNED POST MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	3.21 34	3.23 26	2.50 14	2.74 42	a

a SIGNIFICANT ($P < .05$) CAREER INTENTIONS MAIN EFFECT.

In summary, the satisfaction ratings indicate that dual Army career officers have few complaints beyond child care and pregnancy concerns. Although those who plan on staying in the Army until retirement tend to be more satisfied overall, the satisfaction means even for those in the undecided/leaving group seldom fall below the mid-point (2.5) of the satisfaction scale. The only exceptions are the pregnancy and child care

items, where women who were undecided or planning to leave the Army indicated that they were truly dissatisfied with the current situation. The data further suggest that there are differences in the types of things those who are staying and those who are undecided or leaving find most satisfying. Two factors intrinsically associated with the Army, Army job and assigned post, are especially satisfying for those who intend to stay. However, for those who are undecided or planning on leaving, living quarters and travel are the areas of greatest satisfaction.

Feelings About Work And The Army

The means in Table 15, consistent with the satisfaction data, indicate that both male and female dual Army officers have very positive feelings about both their work and the Army in general.

TABLE 15
OFFICERS: FEELINGS ABOUT WORK AND ARMY
(HIGHER SCORES INDICATE MORE AGREEMENT)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
WORK IS MEANINGFUL, I TAKE PRIDE IN IT			
MEAN.....	3.41	3.47	3.45
STD DEV.....	.54	.44	.49
WORK CONTEXT (PEOPLE, ENVIRONMENT) PLEASANT			
MEAN.....	2.87	2.88	2.88
STD DEV.....	.67	.56	.61
I AM PROUD TO BE IN THE ARMY			
MEAN.....	3.75	3.58	3.66
STD DEV.....	.47	.61	.56
MOST IMPORTANT THINGS TO ME INVOLVE JOB			
MEAN.....	2.40	2.27	2.33
STD DEV.....	.80	.78	.79
WORK MORE IMPORTANT THAN MONEY I EARN			
MEAN.....	3.01	2.80	2.90
STD DEV.....	.79	.73	.76
MAIN INTEREST IN ARMY IS MONEY FOR OTHER THINGS			
MEAN.....	1.53	1.66	1.62
STD DEV.....	.68	.69	.69
JOB SKILLS WILL NOT BE USEFUL IN 5 YRS			
MEAN.....	1.64	1.55	1.59
STD DEV.....	.87	.72	.79

NOTE 1: MALE/FEMALE DIFFERENCES ($P < .05$) ARE UNDERLINED.

NOTE 2: THE FIRST 2 FACTORS ARE MULTIPLE ITEM SCALES.

Nearly all believe that their work is meaningful, and 98% say they are proud to be in the Army. The officers surveyed also generally like the people they work with and find their environments pleasant. The majority (60%), however, do not agree that the most important things that happen to them involve their jobs. This finding is noteworthy, suggesting that even highly committed officers have needs and interests that cannot be satisfied through work alone. Since all the officers in the sample are married, it is reasonable to assume that families are the source of many of the important things that happen to dual Army career officers.

Commitment

Dual Army officers report that their families are committed to the Army mission and lifestyle, and both sexes strongly reject the notion that dual Army couples are harmful to the Army mission (see Table 16). Men and women also believe that the Army can count on dual Army couples in an emergency or deployment (86% agree), however, men express a stronger level of agreement.

TABLE 16
OFFICERS: DUAL ARMY COUPLES' (DACs) COMMITMENT TO ARMY
(HIGHER SCORES INDICATE MORE AGREEMENT)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
IN EMERGENCY ARMY CAN COUNT ON DACS			
MEAN.....	<u>3.40</u>	<u>3.02</u>	3.20
STD DEV.....	<u>.82</u>	<u>.81</u>	.83
IF CONFLICT BET. FAMILY & ARMY NEEDS, ARMY 1ST			
MEAN.....	2.64	2.47	2.55
STD DEV.....	.88	.84	.86
OUR FAMILY COMMITTED TO ARMY LIFESTYLE & MISSION			
MEAN.....	3.30	3.21	3.25
STD DEV.....	.60	.67	.64
DACS ARE HARMFUL TO ARMY MISSION			
MEAN.....	1.43	1.44	1.44
STD DEV.....	.74	.79	.77

NOTE 1: MALE/FEMALE DIFFERENCES ($P < .05$) ARE UNDERLINED.

It is interesting that while nearly all officers thought that dual Army couples could be counted on in an emergency, they were somewhat ambivalent about their loyalties in the face of non-specific conflicts between work and family. Officers as a group were fairly evenly split between those who agreed (36%) and those who disagreed (39%) that in the event of a conflict between family needs and the needs of the Army, the Army would come first. The fact that few people expressed strong agreement (14%) or disagreement (10%) with this statement suggests that most people may have mixed feelings. The situation, rather than an absolute Army versus family decision rule may determine priorities in the face of Army/family conflicts less compelling than national emergencies.

Career Priorities And Assignment Problems

Both male and female officers are reluctant to ascribe more importance to their own careers than their spouses' careers (see Table 17). Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the men and 88% of the women disagree with the statement: "In our marriage, my career is the most important." Even on the item that forces a choice: "If I had to choose, my career is more important than my spouse's", only 45% of the men and 14% of the women agreed. When these two items were combined into a scale (see Table 17), women were significantly more likely than men to strongly disagree that their careers were the most important. It is worth reiterating, however, that in the majority of cases, both men and women appear unwilling to say that their careers are more important than their spouses'.

TABLE 17
OFFICERS: CAREER PRIORITIES AND ASSIGNMENT PROBLEMS
(HIGHER SCORES INDICATE MORE AGREEMENT)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
MY CAREER MORE IMPORTANT THAN SPOUSE'S			
MEAN.....	<u>2.27</u>	<u>1.94</u>	2.09
STD DEV.....	.89	.60	.76
JOINT ASSIGNMENT MEANS ONE SPOUSE LOSES GOOD OPP			
MEAN.....	2.46	2.52	2.50
STD DEV.....	.93	.86	.89
I'VE TAKEN BAD ASSIGNMENT TO BE WITH SPOUSE			
MEAN.....	2.12	2.37	2.26
STD DEV.....	.96	.87	.92
SPOUSE TOOK BAD ASSIGNMENT TO BE WITH ME			
MEAN.....	2.18	2.24	2.21
STD DEV.....	.93	.98	.95

NOTE 1: MALE/FEMALE DIFFERENCES ($P < .05$) ARE UNDERLINED.

NOTE 2: THE FIRST FACTOR IS A MULTIPLE ITEM SCALE.

During the interviews, most couples did actually agree that the husband's career would take priority if or when they had to compromise the career of one spouse. However, the interviewees took pains to explain that this decision reflected practical considerations (e.g. promotion potential, children, time in service), rather than a feeling that the wife's career was intrinsically less important or valuable than her husband's.

Most of the couples in the survey have been fortunate, so far, in that neither spouse has had to accept a bad assignment in order for the couple to

stay together. Furthermore, 55% do not believe that joint assignments usually mean that one spouse loses a good opportunity. This optimism is likely to be at least partly a result of the sampling frame (no currently separated couples were included) and partly a function of the relative youth of the sample. As noted earlier, most (64%) of the officers in the sample have been married less than 4 years, and just over half (55%) have fewer than 7 years in the Army. As officers progress through the ranks there are fewer and fewer career enhancing positions available. The longer a dual Army couple is together, the more likely they are to face a situation where the best career moves for each are in different locations.

The data in Table 18 confirm that the longer a couple is married, the more likely they are to have been forced to compromise the career of one or the other partner. Officers married for four or more years are more likely to report that either they (45%) or their spouses (41%) have taken a bad assignment in order to stay together. Only about one quarter of those married on to three years have been in a similar situation.

TABLE 18
OFFICERS: ASSIGNMENT PROBLEMS BY YEARS MARRIED

	1-3 YRS MARRIED		4 + YRS MARRIED		TOTAL	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
IF HAD TO CHOOSE, MY CAREER MORE IMPORTANT						
DISAGREE.....	59	76%	46	68%	105	72%
AGREE.....	19	24%	22	32%	41	28%
JOINT ASSIGNMENT MEANS ONE SPOUSE LOSES GOOD OPP						
DISAGREE.....	44	56%	37	54%	81	55%
AGREE.....	34	44%	32	46%	66	45%
I'VE TAKEN BAD ASSIGNMENT TO BE WITH SPOUSE						
DISAGREE.....	54	74%	37	55%	91	65%
AGREE.....	19	26%	30	45%	49	35%
SPOUSE TOOK BAD ASSIGNMENT TO BE WITH ME						
DISAGREE.....	55	75%	40	59%	95	67%
AGREE.....	18	25%	28	41%	46	33%

Career Support

Although dual Army couples sometimes have to make career compromises to be together, they are very supportive of each others' career intentions (see Table 19). In fact, 88% of the male officers felt that their wives strongly supported their career intentions, and none reported that they received no support at all. The mean for women on the item: "How much does your spouse

support your career intentions?" is lower than the mean for men because of the small percentage of women (6%) whose husbands were "not at all supportive". Nevertheless, the overall level of support received by both husbands and wives is very high.

TABLE 19
OFFICERS: SUPPORT FOR CAREER INTENTIONS
(HIGHER SCORES INDICATE MORE AGREEMENT)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
YOU SUPPORT SPOUSES CAREER			
MEAN.....	3.85	3.91	3.89
STD DEV.....	.40	.32	.36
SPOUSE SUPPORTS YOUR CAREER			
MEAN.....	<u>3.88</u>	<u>3.72</u>	3.79
STD DEV.....	.33	.65	.54
LDR/SUP SUPPORTS SPOUSE CAREER			
MEAN.....	<u>2.95</u>	<u>3.29</u>	3.14
STD DEV.....	.96	.82	.90
LDR/SUP SUPPORTS YOUR CAREER			
MEAN.....	3.47	3.35	3.40
STD DEV.....	.76	.78	.77

NOTE 1: MALE/FEMALE DIFFERENCES ($P < .05$) ARE UNDERLINED.

Both male and female officers also felt that their own leaders or supervisors were very supportive. Men, however, were less likely to perceive their spouses' supervisors as being supportive. Almost a third (32%) of the men said that their wives' supervisors showed little or no support for their spouses' career intentions. Among female officers, on the other hand, only 18% felt that their husbands' supervisors were not supportive. What this difference actually means in terms of Army support for women's career intentions is ambiguous, however. These items refer to support for career intentions, rather than simply support for one's career, and in many cases female officers' career intentions lean toward leaving the Army. Husbands who feel that their wives are not supported may be indicating that their wives' supervisors want them to stay despite their inclination to leave, or they may be indicating that they are particularly sensitive to any slights or discrimination their spouses may suffer on the job. The interview responses, as well as the data on equal opportunity (see Table 20) tend to support the latter interpretation. Men strongly disagree that their wives have an advantage because of their sex. In future research it would be useful to distinguish between support for an individual's Army career, and support for the individual's own career preferences and intentions.

Promotion Opportunities

On the whole, both men and women are quite optimistic about their promotion opportunities (see Table 20). Eighty-eight percent (88%) and 86% of the male and female officers, respectively, agree that their promotion chances are good. A large majority (75%) also agree that promotions in the Army are fair. There is evidence, however, that a sizable minority of officers believe that women do not have equal opportunities for career development in the Army. About one fourth of the officers surveyed did not agree that Army promotions were fair and that both spouses had equal opportunities for career development in the Army. In addition, 27% of the women (in contrast to 7% of the men) agreed that their spouses had more opportunity for career development because of their sex.

TABLE 20
OFFICERS: BELIEFS ABOUT PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES
(HIGHER SCORES INDICATE MORE AGREEMENT)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
MY PROMOTION CHANCES ARE GOOD			
MEAN.....	3.31	3.19	3.25
STD DEV.....	.87	.80	.84
PROMOTIONS IN ARMY ARE FAIR			
MEAN.....	2.90	2.79	2.84
STD DEV.....	.91	.74	.82
SPOUSE & I HAVE EQUAL OPPS FOR CAREER DEV			
MEAN.....	3.10	2.88	2.99
STD DEV.....	.86	.82	.84
SPOUSE HAS MORE CAREER OPPS BECAUSE OF SEX			
MEAN.....	1.81	2.20	2.02
STD DEV.....	.66	.87	.80

NOTE 1: MALE/FEMALE DIFFERENCES ($P < .05$) ARE UNDERLINED.

Several of the interview comments suggested that although the Army as a whole is viewed quite favorably with regard to the opportunities available to women, a woman's career can still be adversely affected by men who see the Army as a "man's world", and want to keep it that way. For example, one woman said that despite her excellent performance record, she had not been truly accepted as an "insider" yet, and that being excluded from the influential, informal, inner circle could have a negative impact on her career. Another woman noted that her husband had greater promotion potential (and thus his career would take precedence over hers) because he was being "groomed" for more senior positions while she was not. In noting such instances of perceived inequality, however, it is worth reiterating that despite the traditionally male orientation of the Army, the majority of women surveyed did not feel that their sex created any barriers to their advancement.

Army Treatment of Dual Army Couples

Male and female officers are very similar in their feelings about the way the Army treats Army dual career couples, and by and large, these feelings are positive (see Table 21). A large majority of the sample (81%) agree that the Army tries to accommodate dual Army couples, and nearly as many (71%) believe that the Army treats soldiers and their families fairly. Most also see room for improvement, however. Seventy-nine percent (79%) believe that the family needs to be given a higher priority in the assignment system.

TABLE 21
OFFICERS: ARMY TREATMENT OF DUAL ARMY COUPLES (DACs)
(HIGHER SCORES INDICATE MORE AGREEMENT)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
ARMY TRIES TO ACCOMMODATE DUAL ARMY COUPLES			
MEAN.....	2.78	2.91	2.85
STD DEV.....	.69	.53	.61
ARMY TREATS SOLDIERS & FAMILIES FAIRLY			
MEAN.....	2.75	2.69	2.72
STD DEV.....	.56	.65	.61
FAMILY NEEDS HIGHER PRIORITY IN ASSIGNMENTS			
MEAN.....	3.13	3.14	3.14
STD DEV.....	.74	.80	.77
ARMY SHOWS FAVORITISM IN POLICIES FOR DACs			
MEAN.....	1.51	1.63	1.57
STD DEV.....	.64	.68	.66

NOTE 1: MALE/FEMALE DIFFERENCES ($P < .05$) ARE UNDERLINED.

According to the interview data, the belief that families need to be given a higher priority does not mean that dual career couples expect or want their needs to take precedence over the Army's needs. Instead, dual career couples would like to see some flexibility built into the system to allow their needs to be met in ways that would not jeopardize the Army mission. For example, one person suggested that the Army might reconsider whether it is really necessary for all officers to go to Europe or take unaccompanied tours in order to advance their careers. Another commented that restrictions on when someone can go to school might be relaxed to give dual careerists more flexibility. Several people also mentioned that it seemed unnecessarily limiting to automatically prohibit spouses from working in the same battalion. It was suggested that commanders could be given the authority to decide, based on individual situations, when it is and is not appropriate to have a married couple in a battalion. In short, dual Army officers acknowledge that the Army is trying to accommodate them, but most appear to believe that the Army could give more emphasis to family concerns and build more flexibility into the assignment system without jeopardizing Army needs or mission.

Personal And Family Concerns

Table 22 indicates that balancing their soldier and spouse roles is not problematic for most dual Army couples. Women tend to agree that they would like to see their spouses help out more around the house, however the distribution of household tasks does not appear to be a major problem. The conflicts that do exist seems to center around children. Half of both the male (54%) and female (51%) officers agree that children suffer when both parents are in the Army. This belief was echoed in the comments of several of the officers interviewed. The long hours required of an officer limit the amount of time available for children, and this factor, more than any other, was the reason many interviewees believed it was nearly impossible to do justice to both children and a military career. About half of the very small sample of childless interviewees indicated that if/when they had children, the mother would leave the service in order to have more time to devote to the family.

TABLE 22

OFFICERS: PERSONAL AND FAMILY CONCERNS

(HIGHER SCORES INDICATE MORE AGREEMENT OR MORE OFTEN)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
AS DAC, FEW PEOPLE TO SOCIALIZE WITH			
MEAN.....	1.99	2.01	2.00
STD DEV.....	.90	1.02	.96
I CAN COMFORTABLY BALANCE SOLDIER & SPOUSE ROLES			
MEAN.....	3.58	3.59	3.58
STD DEV.....	.72	.61	.66
CHILDREN SUFFER WHEN BOTH PARENTS IN ARMY			
MEAN.....	2.53	2.50	2.51
STD DEV.....	.97	1.00	.98
WISH SPOUSE WOULD DO MORE HOME CHORES			
MEAN.....	2.05	2.61	2.35
STD DEV.....	.85	.91	.92

NOTE 1: MALE/FEMALE DIFFERENCES ($P < .05$) ARE UNDERLINED.

The particular problems encountered by dual Army couples who currently have children are examined in the next section.

Officers with Children

A small number of questions about stress and childcare were asked only of those officers who had children. Because of the small number of officers in the sample who had children, results from this subsample cannot be assumed to be reliable or generalizable. Data from the officers with children are presented in Tables 23 through 26, however, the results should be interpreted merely as suggestive trends, or hypotheses to be tested in future research.

Table 23 indicates that female officers are more likely than male officers to find being a parent, spouse, and soldier stressful. Women also appear more likely than men to be the ones to take time off from work for the children, although it is worth noting that many men do report that they also take time off for child-related reasons.

TABLE 23
OFFICERS WITH CHILDREN:
WORK/FAMILY ROLE CONFLICT
(HIGH SCORE INDICATES MORE OFTEN)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
STRESSFUL BEING PARENT, SPOUSE & SOLDIER MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	2.87 23	3.52 23	3.20 46
BEING SOLDIER MEANS NO TIME TO BE GOOD PARENT MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	2.14 21	2.45 22	2.30 43
I TAKE TIME OFF TO DO THINGS FOR CHILD MEAN..... RESPONDENTS.....	2.55 22	3.05 22	2.80 44

TABLE 24
OFFICERS WITH CHILDREN:
CURRENT CHILDCARE ARRANGEMENTS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
WHEN BOTH AT WORK WHO WITH CHLD?						
CC CENTER ON POST.....	2	9%	2	11%	4	10%
PRIV CC CNT/NURSRY....	4	17%	4	21%	8	19%
PRIVATE BABYSITTER....	13	57%	10	53%	23	55%
RELATIVE, NOT SPOUSE...	1	4%	1	5%	2	5%
NO FORMAL CC ARR.....	3	13%	2	11%	5	12%
PREFERRED CC ARRANGEMENTS						
CC CENTER ON POST.....	1	5%	1	5%	2	5%
PRIV CC CNT/NURSRY....	1	5%	0	0%	1	2%
PRIVATE BABYSITTER....	1	5%	1	5%	2	5%
RELATIVE NOT SPOUSE...	2	9%	2	11%	4	10%
SAT W PRES CC ARR.....	17	77%	15	79%	32	78%
HOW SAT ARE YOU WITH CHILDCARE?						
SATISFIED.....	6	26%	9	43%	15	34%
VERY SATISFIED.....	17	74%	12	57%	29	66%
HOW MUCH DOES CC COST A WEEK?						
NOTHING.....	2	9%	2	10%	4	9%
\$26-\$35.....	2	9%	3	14%	5	11%
\$36-\$45.....	5	22%	5	24%	10	23%
\$46-\$55.....	4	17%	4	19%	8	18%
\$56 OR MORE.....	10	43%	7	33%	17	39%

The majority of dual career parents hire private babysitters or use private day care centers to care for their children during the day (see Table 24). Very few (10%) use post daycare facilities. Generally, parents report being very satisfied with their current arrangements.

The more specific items on the quality of childcare arrangements indicate that parents are quite happy with both the quality and reliability of the arrangements they have made (see Table 25). They are also moderately satisfied with the convenience of their childcare in terms of both hours and location, although care for sick children is still a problem for most. Ratings of the post daycare facilities indicate why so few parents (10%) use on-post centers (see Table 26). Inconvenient or inadequate hours of operation, long waiting lists and poor child/staff ratios appear to be the primary reasons dual career parents do not find post facilities adequate to meet their needs.

TABLE 25
OFFICERS WITH CHILDREN:
SATISFACTION WITH CHILDCARE ARRANGEMENTS
(HIGH SCORE INDICATES MORE AGREEMENT)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
HAPPY WITH QUALITY OF CHILDCARE MEAN.....	3.25	3.56	3.39
RESPONDENTS.....	20	18	38
ARRANGEMENT IS FAIRLY RELIABLE MEAN.....	3.35	3.58	3.46
RESPONDENTS.....	20	19	39
HOURS CONVENIENT TO WORK SCHEDULE MEAN.....	3.15	3.06	3.11
RESPONDENTS.....	20	18	38
LOCATION CONVENIENT TO WORK MEAN.....	2.95	3.28	3.11
RESPONDENTS.....	20	18	38
PROBLEM WHEN CHILD IS SICK MEAN.....	2.50	2.45	2.47
RESPONDENTS.....	20	20	40

TABLE 26
OFFICERS WITH CHILDREN:
QUALITY OF POST DAYCARE FACILITIES
(HIGH SCORE INDICATES MORE AGREEMENT)

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
CLEAN CHILD CARE FACILITIES			
MEAN.....	2.50	3.00	2.76
RESPONDENTS.....	10	11	21
TRAINED STAFF			
MEAN.....	2.36	2.70	2.52
RESPONDENTS.....	11	10	21
ENOUGH STAFF FOR CHILDREN			
MEAN.....	2.30	2.36	2.33
RESPONDENTS.....	10	11	21
NO ED ACTIVS FOR CHILDREN			
MEAN.....	2.60	2.60	2.60
RESPONDENTS.....	10	10	20
PRIM PLAY ACTIVITIES FOR KIDS			
MEAN.....	2.60	2.18	2.38
RESPONDENTS.....	10	11	21
LOCATION CONVENIENT			
MEAN.....	3.00	2.79	2.89
RESPONDENTS.....	13	14	27
REASONABLE PRICE			
MEAN.....	2.92	3.00	2.96
RESPONDENTS.....	12	13	25
LONG WAITING LIST			
MEAN.....	2.20	3.30	2.75
RESPONDENTS.....	10	10	20
HOURS OF OPERATION MEET MY NEEDS			
MEAN.....	2.25	1.79	2.00
RESPONDENTS.....	12	14	26

CONCLUSIONS

The data from this study indicate that early in their careers, the male partners in dual Army career couples are more likely to have made a firm commitment to an Army career than their spouses. These findings are consistent with the results of studies of dual military couples in the Navy and the Air Force (Farkas and Durning, 1982; Orthner, 1980; Orthner and Bowen, 1982). The percentages of men and women intending to stay in the service are not directly comparable across studies, however, because of differences in the composition of the samples (previous studies included both officer and enlisted dual career couples).

In both the present study and prior research (Farkas and Durning, 1982; Raiha, 1986) the possibility of a long-term separation from one's spouse

appears to be a critical factor in the career considerations of both men and women in dual military career marriages. Only about one fourth of the women and one third of the men in this study reported that they would accept a year long separation from their spouses, and joint domicile emerged as the most important career decision factor for both male and female officers. Furthermore, 44% of the women surveyed said they would leave the Army rather than endure a lengthy family separation. In interpreting this data it is important to keep in mind that this sample included only dual Army career couples who were currently assigned to the same post. Individuals who are living apart from their spouses might have different feelings about the acceptability of family separations. This is an issue which needs to be explored in future research.

Concerns about children are also an important career issue for a number of women. The majority of dual military career couples are childless in both this and other studies (Orthner, 1980; Orthner and Bowen, 1982; Williams, 1978), but of the women who do want to have children, many appear to have serious reservations about staying in the Army. Over a third of the women surveyed stated that pregnancy and childcare concerns were very important career decision factors. The low levels of satisfaction associated with childcare issues and Army attitudes toward pregnancy suggest that many women view dual Army careers and children as being incompatible.

The problems inherent in coordinating two military careers can force spouses to make some difficult choices, but few couples appear to fall voluntarily into the traditional pattern of viewing the wife's career as secondary. Both men and women in this sample were very supportive of their spouses' careers and appeared reluctant to say that the career of one spouse was more important than the career of the other. The high level of support women in this sample received from their spouses is inconsistent with the results of the Air Force studies (Orthner, 1980; Orthner and Bowen, 1982) where women received considerably less support for their careers than men. The reason for the inconsistency is unclear, however, it is possible that attitudes toward working women in general have become more liberal over the past five to seven years.

The attitudes expressed by the respondents toward their jobs and the Army environment in general, were very positive. The officers in the sample overwhelmingly liked their work and were proud of being in the Army. The majority also believed that the Army was making an effort to accommodate dual career couples, but they saw room for improvement in the system. Most believed that the Army should give more emphasis to family concerns.

The dual career officers examined in this research appeared to have a fairly balanced orientation toward their families and their careers. The officers' commitment to their duty in the event of war was overwhelmingly confirmed, yet most officers said that except in the case of a national emergency, Army/family conflicts would not necessarily be resolved in favor of the Army. The large number of women in the early stage of their careers who are still undecided about remaining in the Army may be waiting to see if the demands of an Army career will allow them to maintain the kind of family/career balance they would prefer.

In summary, the data on dual career Army officers is generally consistent with the limited data available on dual military career couples in other services. Women are less likely than men to have firm intentions to stay in the Army early in their careers, and concerns about separations, and pregnancy and childcare are to be especially salient for women. Dual career husbands in the present study were very supportive of their wives careers and appeared to be sensitive to problems (e.g., discrimination) which might impede the professional advancement of their wives. The job satisfaction and Army commitment of these dual career officers was very high, but the importance of family considerations was very apparent. The trends detected here appear to be consistent with the trends toward more egalitarian ideals and more balanced career/family orientations social scientists have observed in society at large (Derr, 1986). Army policy makers need to be attuned to these shifting values as well as the demographic changes in the Army if they are to optimize both the potential and retention of their officers.

The results presented here suggest several issues future researchers need to address. First, researchers interested in the career decisions of women in the Army need to recognize that most married women in the Army are in dual Army career marriages. Women, therefore, are much more likely than men to have another military career in the family to consider when they weigh the benefits of military versus civilian job opportunities. Comparisons between male and female soldiers are likely to be confounded if the prevalence of dual Army career marriages among women is not taken into account. Second, it would be useful in research on the career intentions of both men and women in dual Army career marriages to have information on their plans and preferences with regard to children. It appears that child related concerns are important considerations in career decisions, yet the impact of plans to have children on retention decisions are seldom explored. In addition, it would be useful to have information on the percentages of men and women in dual Army career marriages who: a) plan to combine two military careers with children, b) have decided to forego having children in order to pursue their careers, or c) have decided that one or both spouses need to leave the military if they are to have the kind of family life they desire. Data on actual retention decisions also need to be obtained to examine the extent to which behavior is consistent with the career intentions expressed in surveys. When both spouses are in the Army, a change in the career situation of one spouse may have an effect on the career decisions of the other. This raises the possibility that the career intentions of dual Army career couples may be less stable, or more subject to change with changes in the family or career status of a spouses than the career intentions of soldiers married to civilians.

Future research which examines differences in the Army experiences of couples who are, and who are not happy with their dual Army career lifestyle may also further efforts to identify the most problematic characteristics of Army life for dual Army career couples. Research suggests that time requirements of the Army job, perceptions of equal opportunity, problems associated with pregnancy and childcare, and the likelihood of family separations may all be important factors. Subsequent research samples should also include couples who are currently separated from their spouses in order to fully assess the impact of actual, as opposed to anticipated, family separations on satisfaction and retention.

The present research represents only a beginning effort to better understand the needs and issues facing dual Army career couples. Research aimed more specifically at uncovering how individuals in dual Army career couples perceive their options, deal with constraints and make decisions about their careers is needed if decision makers are to make informed decisions about the Army policies and programs affecting this growing subgroup of the Army population.

REFERENCES

Carr, R., Orthner, D.K., & Brown, R.J. (1980). Living and family patterns in the Air Force. Air University Review, 31, 75-86.

Department of the Army (1986). Soldiers' report IV. Washington, D.C.: Directorate of Human Resources Development, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of the Army.

Derr, C. B. (1986). Managing the new careerists. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Farkas, A.J., and Durning, K.P. (1982). Characteristics and needs of Navy families: Policy Implications (NPRDC SR 83-1). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Orthner, D.K. (1980). Families in blue: Implications of a study of married and single parent families in the U.S. Air Force (USAF Contract F3360-79-C-0423). Greensboro, North Carolina: Family Research and Analysis.

Orthner, D.K. & Bowen, G.L. (1982). Families in blue: Insights from Air Force families in the Pacific (USAF Contract F3360-81-R-0290). Washington, D.C.: SRA Corporation.

Rahtha, N.K. (1986). Dual career couples in the U.S. Army: A descriptive study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1982). Army needs better data to develop policies for sole and inservice parents (GAO/FPCK-82-50). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Williams, J., W., Jr. (1978). Dual-career military families. In E.J. Hunter and S.D. Nice (Eds.), Military families: Adaptation to Change (pp. 103-110). New York: Praeger Publishers.

APPENDIX A. SCALE ITEMS AND RELIABILITIES

SCALES

I. CAREER DECISION FACTORS

(4 point importance scale, high score indicates more importance)

A. Extrinsic factors- pay and benefits (EXTRIN) N=575 $\alpha=.76$

Q4. (PAY)- Pay

Q5. (BENEFIT)-Retirement pay and benefits

Q6. (QUAL)- Quality of medical, dental, dependent care

Q8. (TIME)- Amount of time spent in Army

Q15. (JOBSEC)- Job security

B. Army Lifestyle, Leadership, and People (FARMY)

N=577 $\alpha=.73$

Q3. (FEELING)- Feeling about the Army

Q9. (LDRSHIP)- Army leadership

Q10. (LIFEST)- Army lifestyle (i.e., environment,
organizational structure, discipline)

Q20. (PEOPLE)- People in work environment

C. Dual Career Assignment and Marriage Concerns (DACCON)

N=578 $\alpha=.74$

Q12. (ASSIGN) Assignments

Q13. (MARRIAG) Marriage Concerns

Q16. (JOINTDO) Joint Domicile

Q18. (DUALARM) Army's view of dual Army couples

Q23. (FAMLIFE) Your family life in general

D. Concerns about Pregnancy (PREGCON)

N=578 $\alpha=.76$

Q14. (PREG) Pregnancy

Q24. (PREGWOM) Army's view of pregnant women

II. SATISFACTION WITH... (same as career decision factors)

(4 point satisfaction scale, high score indicates more satisfied)

A. Extrinsic Factors- pay & benefits (SEXTRIN) N=508 $\alpha=.71$

Q114. (PAY) Pay

Q115. (SBENEFI) Retirement pay and benefits

Q116. (SQUAL) Quality of medical, dental, dependent care

Q118. (STIME) Amount of time spent in Army

Q124. (SJORSEC) Job security

B. Army Lifestyle, Leadership and People (SFARMY)

N=566 $\alpha = .79$

- Q113. (SFEELING) Feeling about the Army
- Q119. (SLDRSHIP) Army leadership
- Q120. (SLIFEST) Army lifestyle (i.e., environment,
organizational structure, discipline)
- Q129. (SPEOPLE) People in work environment

C. Dual Career Assignment and Marriage Concerns N=554 $\alpha = .72$

- Q122. (SASSIGN) Assignments
- Q123. (SMARRIAG) Marriage concerns
- Q125. (SJOINTDO) Joint domicile
- Q126. (SDUALARM) Army's view of dual Army couples
- Q132. (SFAMLIFE) Your family life in general

III. JOB AND LIFE SATISFACTION

(5 point semantic differential scale, high score is positive)

A. Work is satisfying, important (WORKSAT) N=564 $\alpha = .68$

- Q32. (SUCCESS)- Successful
- Q33. (IMPORTA)- Important
- Q34. (SATISFY)- Satisfying
- Q35. (BEST)- Doing my best

B. Family life is happy, satisfying (FAMSAT) N=528 $\alpha = .94$

- Q66. (HAPPY) Happy
- Q71. (GOOD) Good
- Q72. (BESTFAM) Brings out the best
- Q73. (SATISFAM) Satisfying
- Q74. (IMPFAM) Important
- Q75. (SUCCFAM) Successful

IV. ATTITUDES ABOUT WORK

(four point agreement scale, high score indicates more agreement)

A. Work is meaningful, I take pride in it (WORKMEAN)

N=553 $\alpha = .68$

- Q37. (AFFECTPE) A lot of people are affected by how well I
do my job.
- Q38. (WRKMEAN) The work I do is meaningful.
- Q39. (WRKPRID) I take pride in the work I do.
- Q46. (WRKBEST) At work, I am given a chance to do things that
I do best.

B. Work Context (i.e., people, environment) is pleasant (WORKCONT)
N=553 $\alpha = .67$

Q44. (PEOPME) The people I work with take a personal interest in me.

Q45. (PHYSICA) The physical surroundings at work are pleasant.

Q47. (SUPSUC) My superior is successful in getting people to work together.

V. CAREER PRIORITIES AND DUAL CAREER CONCERNS

(4 point agreement scale, high score indicates more agreement)

A. My career more important than spouse's (MYCARIMP)

N=558 $\alpha = .66$

Q93. (CARINSP) If I had to choose, my career is more important than my spouse's.

Q105. (MYCARE) In our marriage, my career is the most important.

B. Dual Army Status involves career sacrifices (DACSAC)

N=519 $\alpha = .70$

Q83. (LOSE) Joint assignments usually means that one of us loses the opportunity for a good assignment.

Q85. (BADASSI) I have had to take an assignment that I did not want so that I could be stationed with my spouse.

Q89. (SPASSIG) My spouse has had to take an assignment that (s)he did not want so that we could be stationed together.

APPENDIX B. DUAL ARMY CAREER OFFICERS QUESTIONNAIRE

DUAL ARMY COUPLE SURVEY (OFFICER)

Turn your Answer Sheet to SIDE 1. Fill in:

- o Today's Date
- o Social Security Number
- o Ethnic Group
- o College Education
- o High School Education
- o Rank/Grade
- o Sex
- o Form: On the first line from 0 to 9
 - 0 = You DO NOT have dependents (do not include children or spouse)
 - 1 = ONE dependent
 - 2 = TWO dependents
 - 3 = THREE dependents
 - 4 = FOUR dependents
 - 5 = FIVE dependents

Form: On the second line from A to J, total number of children living with you.

- A = You DO NOT have children
- B = One child
- C = Two children
- D = Three children
- E = Four children
- F = Five children
- G = Six or more children

Under SPECIAL CODES:

In Columns A and B, use TWO digits for the NUMBER of YEARS IN SERVICE

In Column C, mark the code of the BRANCH OF SERVICE you are in:

- 0 Regular Army
 - 1 Army Reserves
 - 2 National Guard
 - 3 Other
-

In Column D, mark the code of the TYPE OF UNIT:

- 0. Training (Basic Training, Advanced Individual Training (AIT))
 - 1. Field Artillery, Air Defense Artillery, Armor, Armor Cavalry, Infantry
 - 2. Chemical, Engineer, Military Police, Military Intelligence, Signal, Aviation
 - 3. Adjutant General, Finance, Ordnance, Quartermaster (Supply), Transportation, Medical
 - 4. Headquarter Unit (Garrison without deployment unit)
 - 5. Don't know
-

In Column E, mark the code for SOURCE OF COMMISSIONING.

- 0 OCS
 - 1 USMA
 - 2 ROTC
 - 3 Other
-

In Column F, mark the code for HOW LONG YOU HAVE BEEN COMMISSIONED (in years):

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 0 One-Three years | 4 Thirteen-Fifteen years |
| 1 Four-Six years | 5 Sixteen-Eighteen years |
| 2 Seven-Nine years | 6 Nineteen and over years |
| 3 Ten-Twelve years | |
-

In Column G, mark the code for your CURRENT HOUSING situation.

- 0 On post - barrack/BOQ/BEQ
 - 1 On post - family housing
 - 2 Off post - government funded housing
 - 3 Off post - civilian housing
-

In Columns H and I, use TWO digits for LENGTH OF CURRENT MARRIAGE (in years)

In Column J, mark the code for NUMBER OF TIMES MARRIED

- 0 First
 - 1 Two
 - 2 Three
 - 3 Four or more
-

In Column K, was your CURRENT SPOUSE IN THE ARMY WHEN YOU GOT MARRIED?

- 0 No
 - 1 Yes
-

In Column L, mark the code for STATUS OF SPOUSE.

- 0 Enlisted/NCO
 - 1 Warrant Officer
 - 2 Commissioned Officer
-

In Column M, mark the code for RANK OF SPOUSE.

- | | |
|-------------|-----------|
| 1 E1/W01/01 | 6 E6/ /06 |
| 2 E2/W02/02 | 7 E7/ /07 |
| 3 E3/W03/03 | 8 E8/ /08 |
| 4 E4/W04/04 | 9 E9/ /09 |
| 5 E5/ /05 | |
-

Turn your Answer Sheet to SIDE 2.

Under SPECIAL CODES:

In Columns AA, BB, CC - fill in your Duty MOS (DMOS)

For example, an MOS Code might be 11B, 76C, etc.

In column DD, mark the code for:

How many children 3 Years or Younger do you have living with you?

0	None	2	Two	4	Four	6	Six	8	Eight
1	One	3	Three	5	Five	7	Seven	9	Nine

In column EE, mark the code for:

How many children 4 Years to 11 Years old do you have living with you?

0	None	2	Two	4	Four	6	Six	8	Eight
1	One	3	Three	5	Five	7	Seven	9	Nine

In column FF, mark the code for:

How many children 12 Years to 18 Years old do you have living with you?

0	None	2	Two	4	Four	6	Six	8	Eight
1	One	3	Three	5	Five	7	Seven	9	Nine

In column GG, mark the code for:

How many children 19 Years or older do you have living with you?

0	None	2	Two	4	Four	6	Six	8	Eight
1	One	3	Three	5	Five	7	Seven	9	Nine

Turn your Answer Sheet to SIDE 1.

1. What are your career intentions at the present time?

I will:

- A. stay in the Army until retirement
- B. stay after completion of obligation, but undecided about staying until retirement
- C. I am undecided about action after present obligation
- D. probably leave upon completion of present obligation
- E. definitely leave upon completion of present obligation
- F. probably leave before the end of present obligation
- G. definitely leave before the end of present obligation

Using the scale below, indicate how important would each of the following is to you in making this decision.

A	B	C	D	E
Very	Fairly	Fairly	Not Important	Not
Important	Important	Unimportant	at all	Applicable

- 2. Job
- 3. Feelings about the Army
- 4. Pay
- 5. Retirement pay and benefits
- 6. Quality of medical, dental, dependent care
- 7. Family influence
- 8. Amount of time spent in Army
- 9. Army leadership
- 10. Army lifestyle (i.e., environment, organizational structure, discipline)
- 11. Child care concerns
- 12. Assignments
- 13. Marriage concerns
- 14. Pregnancy
- 15. Job security
- 16. Joint domicile
- 17. The Army's view of dual Army couples
- 18. Travel
- 19. Promotion potential
- 20. People in work environment
- 21. Living quarters
- 22. The post where I am assigned
- 23. Your family life in general
- 24. The Army's view of pregnant women

25. What are your spouse's career intentions at the present time?

(S)he will:

- A. stay in the Army until retirement
- B. stay after completion of enlistment/obligation, but undecided about staying until retirement
- C. Is undecided about action after present enlistment/obligation
- D. probably leave upon completion of present enlistment/obligation
- E. definitely leave upon completion of present enlistment/obligation
- F. probably leave before the end of present enlistment/obligation
- G. definitely leave before the end of present enlistment/obligation

The scale below should be used for the following statements.

- | A | B | C | D |
|----------|--|----------|-------------|
| Strongly | | Somewhat | Strongly Do |
| Support | Support | Support | Not Support |
| 26. | How much do you support your spouse's career intentions? | | |
| 27. | How much does your spouse support your career intention? | | |
| 28. | How much does the unit leader or supervisor support your spouse's career intentions? | | |
| 29. | How much does the unit leader or supervisor support your career intention? | | |

30. On an average week, how many hours do you spend at work?

- A. 40-45 hours
- B. 46-50 hours
- C. 51-55 hours
- D. 56-60 hours
- E. 61 or more hours

31. Do you work the same hours each week or different hours each week?

- A. Same hours each week
- B. Different hours (shifts) each week

The next set of items deal with your feelings related to work. For example, if you think that you are very "successful" in your work, mark A on your answer sheet; if you think you are "not successful", mark E. If you think you are somewhere in between, Mark a letter between A and E.

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| 32. | Successful | A | B | C | D | E | Not Successful |
| 33. | Important | A | B | C | D | E | Not Important |
| 34. | Satisfying | A | B | C | D | E | Dissatisfying |
| 35. | Doing My Best | A | B | C | D | E | Not Doing My Best |
| 36. | Boring | A | B | C | D | E | Interesting |

Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

A	B	C	D
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

37. A lot of people are affected by how well I do my job.
38. The work I do is meaningful.
39. I take pride in the work I do.
40. I feel that my present job skills will not be useful five years from now.
41. My main interest in the Army is to get enough money to do the other things that I want to do.
42. My work is more important for me than the money I earn.
43. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.
44. The people I work with take a personal interest in me.
45. The physical surroundings at work are pleasant.
46. At work, I am given a chance to do things that I do best.
47. My supervisor is successful in getting people to work together.

Using the scale below, indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

A	B	C	D
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

48. I have too much at stake in my job to leave the Army before retirement.
49. It would be easy to find a civilian job with about the same income and benefits that I have now.
50. There is a shortage of soldiers in my MOS/specialty who have my experience, training and skills.
51. I can't quit the Army because I can't find a job.
52. I have better promotion potential than my spouse.
53. I can't advance as far because of restrictions on MOS or specialty.
54. My spouse is proud that I am in the Army.
55. I am proud that my spouse is in the the Army.
56. My spouse listens to me when I talk about work.
57. My spouse helps me be a good soldier.
58. A great deal of what I have achieved is due to my spouse.
59. Being a dual Army couple is hard because of the competition between us.
60. My spouse wants me to get out of the Army
61. My role as a soldier and my role as a family member are completely separate.
62. I often think about a family problem when I am at my job.
63. My family life and work life seldom interfere with each other.
64. The most important things that happen to me involve my family.
65. The Army really does take care of its families.

The next set of items deal with your feelings about your family life. For example, if you think that your family life is very "happy", mark A on your answer sheet. If you think your family life is "sad" mark E. If you think that your family life is somewhere in between, mark a letter between A and E.

66. Happy	A	B	C	D	E	Sad
67. Enjoyable	A	B	C	D	E	Not Enjoyable
68. Worried	A	B	C	D	E	Not Worried
69. Full	A	B	C	D	E	Okay
70. Tied Down	A	B	C	D	E	Free
71. Good	A	B	C	D	E	Bad
72. Brings out the Best	A	B	C	D	E	Brings out the Worst
73. Satisfying	A	B	C	D	E	Dissatisfying
74. Important	A	B	C	D	E	Not Important
75. Successful	A	B	C	D	E	Unsuccessful

Using the scale below, indicate how often you feel that the following statements describe you.

A	B	C	D	E
Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Not Applicable

76. I experience a lot of stress being a parent, a spouse and a soldier.
77. It is difficult for me to be a soldier.
78. Being a soldier means that I do not have time to be a good parent.
79. I can comfortably balance the roles of soldier and spouse.
80. When someone has to do something for my child (children), I usually take time off from work.
81. I wish that my spouse would spend more time on home chores.

Using the scale below, indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable

82. In times of war, I will be deployed with my unit.
83. Joint assignments usually mean that one of us loses the opportunity for a good assignment.
84. As a dual Army couple, we don't have many people with whom to socialize.
85. I have had to take an assignment that I did not want so that I could be stationed with my spouse.
86. Children suffer when both parents are in the Army.
87. Both of us have had equal opportunities for career development in the Army.
88. It's okay for enlisted and officers to socialize after work hours.
89. My spouse has had to take an assignment that (s)he did not want so that we could be stationed together.
90. Pregnant soldiers do not belong in the Army.
91. Pregnant soldiers do their jobs just as well as anyone else.
92. Dual Army couples are harmful to the Army mission.
93. If I had to choose, my career is more important than my spouse's.
94. I feel that my chances for promotion are good.
95. In general, promotions within the Army are handled fairly.
96. Dual army couples are more committed to the Army than other Army families.
97. The Army is too strict about enlisted-officer couples.
98. Fraternization negatively affects morale and discipline.
99. The Army shows favoritism by making specific policies for dual Army couples.
100. In times of deployment or war, the Army can count on dual Army couples.
101. In times of war, women will be deployed with their units.
102. Most pregnant soldiers tend to "get over".
103. The Army does try to accommodate dual Army soldiers.
104. My spouse has had more opportunity for career development because of his/her sex.
105. In our marriage, my career is the most important
106. I am proud to be in the Army.
107. If there is a conflict between our family's needs and the Army's needs, the Army comes first.
108. The family needs to be given higher priority by the Army assignment system.
109. The Army treats its members and their families fairly and justly.
110. Our family shares a commitment to the lifestyle and mission of the Army.

111. If future assignments require long separation (more than one year) from your spouse, what will you do?

- A. Take the assignment and accept the separation
- B. I will leave the Army
- C. Spouse will leave the Army
- D. Other

Using the scale below, indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following:

A	B	C	D	E
Very			Very	Not
Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Applicable

- 112. Job
- 113. Feelings about the Army
- 114. Pay
- 115. Retirement pay and benefits
- 116. Quality of medical, dental, dependent care
- 117. Family influence
- 118. Amount of time spent in Army
- 119. Army leadership
- 120. Army lifestyle (i.e., environment, organizational structure, discipline)
- 121. Child care concerns
- 122. Assignments
- 123. Marriage concerns
- 124. Job security
- 125. Joint domicile
- 126. The Army's view of dual Army couples
- 127. Travel
- 128. Promotion potential
- 129. People in work environment
- 130. Living quarters
- 131. The post where I am assigned
- 132. Your family life in general
- 133. The Army's view of pregnant women

FOR RESPONDENTS WITH DEPENDENTS

Please use the following scale to answer the next set of questions.

A	B	C	D
No	Probably Not	Maybe	Yes

Will your dependent care arrangements work for the following situations?

- 134. Short term emergency situations such as mobilization exercise
- 135. Long term situation such as unit deployment
- 136. Evacuation due to wartime situation
- 137. I don't have a dependent care plan

FOR RESPONDENTS WITH CHILDREN

138. When you and your spouse are at work, who takes care of your child (children)?

- A. The childcare center at the installation
- B. Private daycare center or nursery
- C. Private babysitter
- D. relative other than spouse
- E. No formal child care arrangements

139. How satisfied are you with your childcare?

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Satisfied
- C. Dissatisfied
- D. Very dissatisfied

140. How much do these arrangements cost you a week?

- A. Nothing
- B. \$1 - \$25
- C. \$26 - \$35
- D. \$36 - \$45
- E. \$46 - \$55
- F. \$56 or more

141. What other childcare arrangements would you prefer instead of the one that you have now?

- A. The childcare center at the installation
- B. Private daycare center or nursery
- C. Private babysitter
- D. Relative other than the spouse
- E. I am satisfied with my present childcare arrangements

Use the scale below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly			Strongly	Not
Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Applicable

- 142. I am very happy with the quality of my childcare arrangements.
- 143. My childcare arrangements causes me problems with work.
- 144. The childcare arrangement I have is fairly reliable.
- 145. The schedule of childcare arrangement is convenient in relation to my work schedule.
- 146. When my child is sick, there is a problem with the childcare arrangement.
- 147. The location or place where my child is cared for is convenient in relation to where I work.

Use the scale below to describe the childcare facilities on your installation.

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly			Strongly	I Don't
Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Know

- 148. Clean
- 149. Trained staff members
- 150. Enough staff members for the number of children
- 151. Long enrollment waiting list
- 152. Convenient location
- 153. Reasonably priced
- 154. No educational activities for the children
- 155. Primarily play activities for children
- 156. The hours of operation meet my needs

157. On the average, how many hours do you spend each week with your children?

- | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| A. None | F. 21 - 25 hours |
| B. Less than 5 hours | G. 26 - 30 hours |
| C. 6 - 10 hours | H. 31 - 35 hours |
| D. 11 - 15 hours | I. 36 - 40 hours |
| E. 16 - 20 hours | J. 41 or more hours |